THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. 124.

PUBLISHED IN

JANUARY & APRIL, 1868.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1868.

LONDON:
Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and SONS, Stamford Street,
and Charing Cross.

CONTENTS

OF

No. 247.

CONTENTS

OF

No. 248

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Art. I.—*Memoirs of the Life of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* By John Gibson Lockhart. Edinburgh, 1837-38.

OUR readers will doubtless understand the reasons which have hitherto restrained us from formally noticing the very interesting volumes to which we are now about to draw their attention.

Long after the 'Life of Scott' had been completed and published, the 'Quarterly Review' continued to run its course under the management of Scott's accomplished biographer. It was manifestly impossible for Mr. Lockhart to print, in what might be called his own journal, a criticism on a work of which he was himself the author. It was equally impossible, for a good while after Mr. Lockhart's death, that any competent person who had enjoyed his friendship, and the friendship of the great hero of his tale, should touch the subject. Men do not write freely about those whom they have long loved and recently lost; and so year after year stole away without any notice being taken of perhaps the very best piece of biography which is to be found in the English or any other modern language. But time, which softens men's regrets, awakens, or ought to awaken them to a sense of duty: and duty rather to the living than to the dead requires that the silence which we have thus far maintained should at length be broken. For not Lockhart only, but Scott himself, both as a man and as a writer, seems to be in danger of passing—we cannot conceive why—out of the knowledge of the rising generation. Doubtless there will be found at most railway stations cheap copies of Scott's poems and of the Waverley Novels, which travellers purchase, one by one, that they may read them on the journey as they read any worthless trash, and then throw them away. But the instances are rare, we suspect, in which, even among educated persons, young men or young women under five-and-twenty know anything at all either of what Scott wrote or of what he did. Now we look upon this fact, if a fact it be, as a great public misfortune. You cannot find a surer test of the habits of thought in a people than by taking note of the light literature which is most in favour with the young of its edu-

cated classes. When we find such great works as 'Waverley,' 'Guy Mannering,' and the 'Antiquary' cast aside, in order that young ladies and young gentlemen may break their hearts over the sorrows of bigamists and adulterers, we confess that the impression made upon our minds is not very flattering—we do not say to the tastes, but to the moral sense of the age. But young ladies and young gentlemen will more easily be persuaded, we think, to seek recreation in the works of an author who has passed from the stage, when they know something of what he himself said and did while yet he trod the boards. Wherefore, postponing for the present everything like critical examination into the merits of Scott's writings, whether in verse or prose, we intend in the following pages to sketch the career of Scott himself; looking, almost exclusively, for the materials wherewith to accomplish this purpose to the charming work, the title of which stands at the head of this article.

The Scottish capital has the honour of claiming Sir Walter Scott as one of the most illustrious of the many illustrious sons whom she has reared. He was born in the Old Town of Edinburgh, on the 15th of August, 1771, in an old street called the College Wynd, and in a house which soon after his birth was pulled down in order to make way for a new front to the college itself. His descent, according to his own showing, 'was neither distinguished nor sordid, but such as the prejudices of his country justified him in accounting gentle.' He traced his line back, on the one side, through a succession of Jacobite gentlemen and Moss-troopers, to *Auld Scott* of Harden and his spouse, renowned in border song as 'The Flower of Yarrow.' His pedigree on the other side connected him with the 'Bauld Rutherfords that were sae stout,' the MacDougals of Lorn, and the Swintons of Swinton. All this is duly set forth in the fragment of autobiography with which Mr. Lockhart has prefaced his deeply interesting volumes, besides being emblazoned on the panels of the ceiling in the hall at Abbotsford. But the noblest pedigrees do not necessarily shield those who lay claim to them from the vicissitudes of fortune. There are at this moment in the east of London more than one small shopkeeper whose lineal descent from the Plantagenets cannot be questioned. So it was with the branch of the Scott family to which Sir Walter belonged. His grandfather, after trying and abandoning the humble career of a merchant seaman, settled down upon the lands of Sandy-Knowe as a tenant-farmer under Mr. Scott of Harden. The farmer's eldest son, the father of Sir Walter, was bred, the first of his family, to a town life. Having served an apprenticeship to a Writer to the Signet, he was taken as a partner

into

into the house, and on the death of the head of the firm succeeded to the business. This gentleman, Mr. Walter Scott, married the eldest daughter of Dr. W. Rutherford, a physician in good practice, and Professor of Medicine in the University of Edinburgh. Not fewer than twelve children were the fruit of their union. There must, however, have been great delicacy of constitution in the race, for seven out of the twelve died in infancy, and from among the remaining five, one only, Sir Walter himself, barely reached the limits of old age.

At the period of his birth, and for about eighteen months subsequently, Scott was as robust and healthy a child as ever breathed. A full, broad chest, and well-knit frame, gave promise indeed of more than common vigour in after years. And, subject to one grievous defect, this promise was fulfilled. But the nurse, when about to place him one morning in his bath, discovered that he had lost the use of one of his limbs. No one could account for the misfortune, because he had been more than usually playful and active the night before. All that skill and tenderness could devise failed to remove it. At last his parents were recommended to try the effect of country air, and he was sent to Sandy-Knowe. 'It is here,' he says, speaking of himself, 'at Sandy-Knowe, in the residence of my paternal grandfather, that I had the first consciousness of existence;' and how deep and indelible the impression was which the scenery of that romantic spot made upon his imagination, the readers of 'Marmion' and the 'Eve of St. John,' do not need to be reminded. Nor was it exclusively from the features of the landscape, including as these did some of the most striking objects on the Scottish border, that early inspiration came. After spending hours in some sheltered nook, whither the shepherd carried him, that he might look down upon the ewe-milking, and listen to the ewe-milker's songs, he would be borne back again and laid upon a couch, beside which his grandmother and aunt took it by turns to sit, and to keep him in the highest state of happy excitement with their border legends. And when to this we add that to all the neighbours round the sickly child became an object of kindly interest, that one by one they looked in to cheer him with such tales as they could tell — the minister to talk to him about the people whom he had seen, and some of the worthies of Queen Anne's reign with whom he had been acquainted; good Mr. Carte, the farmer at Yet-byre, to describe how brave Scottish cavaliers fought at Prestonpans, and suffered at Carlisle—it is not to be wondered at that he should have grown up to be what he really was, the most extraordinary combination

of the heroic and the practical that the world has witnessed in modern times. For this, in point of fact, was the process of his education for years. As soon as he had learned to read, he read ballads and romances. Before he could put two letters together, ballads, romances, and legends were poured through his ear into his mind; and these, stored up in a tenacious memory, became the elements out of which his moral and intellectual nature grew into shape.

Scott's grandfather was an old man when Scott himself came to Sandy-Knowe; he died before the boy had reached his third year. But no change was thereby occasioned in Walter's circumstances. The widow, assisted by her second son, kept the farm on, and her grandson continued to engross her and her daughter's tenderest care and attention. These were so far rewarded, that, though the limb continued shrunk and withered, the child's general health improved, and improved health brought with it growing energy. The brave little fellow began that struggle against nature, of which he says in his diary that it was maintained throughout life. He first stood, then walked, and by and by, with the help of a stick, began to run. A pony was next provided for him, which he learned to ride with great boldness and to manage with skill. It was thought that the Bath waters might complete the cure thus apparently begun. But though he spent a whole year in Bath, his aunt making the journey with him, nothing came of it, so far as the lameness was concerned. A like result attended his removal to Prestonpans and the application of sea-bathing. Meanwhile his education, using that term in its ordinary sense, was necessarily neglected. He went to no school, there was not the pretence of regularity in his lessons; he was, however, educating himself, as all really great men have usually done. His aunt taught him to read; whatever he read he remembered; and his reading soon became in its own way as large as it was discursive. To what extent this self-education was carried, is shown by a letter from Mrs. Cockburn, the accomplished authoress of the 'Flowers of the Forest.' Writing to one of her friends, in the winter of 1777, she says:—

'I last night supped at Mr. Walter Scott's. He has the most extraordinary genius of a boy I ever saw. He was reading a poem to his mother when I went in. I made him read on, it was the description of a shipwreck. His passion rose with the storm. He lifted his eyes and hands, "There's the mast gone," says he, "crash it goes. They will all perish!" After his agitation, he turns to me. "That is too melancholy," says he, "I had better read you something more amusing." I preferred a little chat, and asked him his opinion of Milton

Milton and other books he was reading, which he gave me wonderfully. One of his observations was—How strange it is that Adam, just new come into the world, should know everything—that must be the poet's fancy, says he. But when he was told he was created perfect by God, he instantly yielded. When taken to bed last night, he told his aunt he liked that lady. "What lady?" says she. "Why Mrs. Cockburn, for I think she is a virtuoso like myself." "Dear Walter," says Aunt Jenny, "what is a virtuoso?" "Don't you know? Why it's one who wishes and will know everything." Now, sir, you will think this a very silly story. Pray what age do you suppose this boy to be? Why, twelve or fourteen. No such thing. He is not quite six years old.'

Another point connected with this early stage in Sir Walter's career deserves notice. He read men and things as closely, and remembered them as well, as he did books. The first play that he ever witnessed he saw in Bath, when he was scarcely five years old. He never forgot it, nor the effect which it produced upon him. The name of Dugald Dalgetty, one of the best drawn characters in all his romances, he took from a half-pay veteran of George II.'s reign, whom he met at Prestonpans. Indeed it is marvellous how, from year to year, and in one locality after another, he gathered up from boyhood scenes, characters, incidents, all of which, as the occasion arose, were drawn forth from the great storehouse of his memory and turned to account. With him the child was indeed the father to the man.

Lockhart says that 'Walter's progress in horsemanship probably reminded his father that it was time he should be learning other things beyond the department of Aunt Jenny and Uncle Thomas.' Be this as it may, the Writer brought his lame son home in 1778; and the same year, after trying first a little private school, and then a private tutor, sent him with his brothers to the High School. His progress there was, by all accounts, more eccentric than steady. He never had patience, then or in after life, to attend to the technicalities of grammar or syntax; but his quick apprehension and powerful memory enabled him to perform with little labour the usual routine of tasks. His place in the class was usually about the middle, with a tendency downwards rather than upwards. Yet his exceeding readiness, and a habit into which he fell of versifying such exercises as were taken from the Latin poets, won him the esteem and respect of the Rector, Dr. Adam. The following instance of his readiness is worth giving.

It happened on one occasion that a stupid boy, boggling at the meaning of the Latin word *cum*, was asked, 'What part of speech is *with?*' The dolt replied, 'A substantive.' The

Rector

Rector, after a moment's pause, thought it worth while to ask the *dux*, or head boy, whether *with* was ever a substantive. No answer was given by him or by others, till it came to Scott's turn, when he replied, 'And Samson said unto Delilah, if they bind me with seven *withs* that were never dried, then shall I be weak, and as another man.'

It was not, however, his quickness in such matters that rendered Walter—what he very soon became—a special favourite with his school-fellows. Two qualities he possessed which are with boys irresistible. He was brave, and, as they were not long in finding out, a capital story-teller. His bravery he exhibited in feats of climbing, such as, considering his lameness, appeared to be miraculous. And he was always ready to fight, provided his opponent would meet him, face to face, both strapped upon a plank. As to his stories, they were at once wondrous and interminable. Many a lesson was indifferently learned in consequence of the eagerness of his class-fellows to listen, even in school-hours; and happy were they who, when the business of school was over—or before it began—succeeded in getting nearest to him in the circle which was drawn round the fire.

Five years constituted the regular course of training at the High School, and Walter went through them,—not, however, without some interruptions. He outgrew his strength, and in consequence of illness was more than once removed. It was on one of these occasions, while residing with his aunt at Kelso, that he made the acquaintance of the brothers Ballantyne, with whom in after life his connection became so intimate. They were the sons of a shopkeeper, and attended the grammar school of the town; at which Walter also—with a view to keep his classics from entirely rusting—gave occasional attendance. His talent as a *raconteur* drew the Ballantynes towards him, for they were as eager to listen as he was ready to narrate; and there sprang up between them that intimacy which seldom fails, among young people, to be created by something like reverence on the one side, and great geniality on the other. The Ballantynes were not, however, the only acquaintances formed in Kelso which reappear in the after life of the subject of this sketch. Not far from the town there dwelt an amiable Quaker and his wife, with whose son young Scott struck up an intimacy, and from whom he received great kindness, especially in the free use which they allowed him to make of their well-selected library. This worthy couple, Mr. and Mrs. Waldie, stood in after years for the originals of Joshua Geddes, of Mount Sharon, and his amiable sister. In like manner, Mr. Whale, the schoolmaster himself—an absent, grotesque being, between six and seven feet high—reappears, at least

least partially, in the character of Dominie Sampson. And so it was wherever Scott went. No peculiarity of manner, speech, habit of thought, or appearance ever escaped him. All oddities which he encountered, whether in men or women, became stereotyped in his imagination, and were brought forth again, and turned to use one by one, as his occasions required.

It was determined to educate Walter for his father's profession; and he passed, with this view, from the High School to the College. His career in the classes which he attended there resembled in all essential points his career at school. He made no figure either as a classic or a metaphysician. But he persevered in a practice long ere this begun, and became an eager collector, in a small way, of old ballads and stories. It was about this time also that he made his first essay in original composition. Two copies of verses bearing the date 1783 have been preserved, one upon a thunderstorm, the other on the setting sun, of which he himself gives the following ludicrous account. 'They were much approved, until a malevolent critic sprang up in the shape of an apothecary's wife, who affirmed that my most sweet poetry was copied from an old magazine. I never forgave the imputation, and even now I acknowledge some resentment against the woman's memory. She, indeed, accused me unjustly when she said I had stolen my poem ready-made; but as I had, like most premature poets, copied all the words and ideas of which my verses consisted, she was so far right. I made one or two faint attempts at verses after I had undergone this sort of daw-plucking; but some friend or other always advised me to put my verses into the fire; and like Dorax in the play, I submitted, though with a swelling heart.'

Of Walter's antiquarian and poetic propensities, the worthy Writer, his father, either knew nothing or pretended to know nothing. A stern Presbyterian and Calvinist, he affected to hold all light literature in abhorrence; yet Whig and Presbyterian as he was, he reckoned among his clients many representatives of old Jacobite families, with whom in the course of business his son came a good deal into contact. But rarely did Mr. Scott invite any one to his table. Walter therefore grew up knowing nothing of what is called society, and finding companionship chiefly among writers' clerks and apprentices. We gather, also, from hints which are thrown out from time to time in Mr. Lockhart's narrative, that even in the article of dress the young Scotts were a good deal neglected. In his mother, however, he found a spirit in many respects akin with his own. She appears to have had considerable taste for letters, and encouraged her son in his pursuits; though even into her mind the

idea

idea seems never to have entered that he was one day to take a foremost place among British authors.

We find Walter again smitten down with illness, soon after he had entered college. On this occasion he burst a blood-vessel; and was compelled for many months to remain in a recumbent position, fed on pulse, and exposed to as much cold as he could bear. He submitted without a murmur to this severe discipline, and found consolation in poetry, romance, and the enthusiasm of young friendship. The bed on which he lay was piled with a constant succession of works of fiction; and John Irving, his companion from the earliest of his school-days, spent hour after hour beside him. His recovery was completed by a second visit to Kelso, where his uncle, Captain Robert Scott, owned a pleasant villa. 'With this illness,' says Scott in his autobiography, 'I bade farewell both to disease and medicine. . . . . My frame became gradually hardened with my constitution, and being both tall and muscular, I was rather disfigured than disabled by my lameness. This personal disadvantage did not prevent me from taking much exercise on horseback, and making long journeys on foot, in the course of which I often walked from twenty to thirty miles a day.' Accordingly, when the College session of 1785-6 opened, he was able to resume his studies. But the time was come for beginning the actual business of life, and on the 15th of May, 1786, the articles of apprenticeship to his father were signed. This circumstance so far interfered with his habits that he was constrained to devote a portion of his time every day to the work of the office. But there was in this no real hardship to him. On the contrary, it made him a ready penman; and as writers' apprentices are paid a small premium on every paper which they copy, he earned enough to gratify, more than ever he had previously done, the ruling passion of his nature. Every shilling which rewarded his industry was laid out in the purchase of books, among which Evan's 'Ballads' and Mickle's 'Cumnor Hall' seem to have especially delighted him; and the pleasure derived from the latter, at least, never died out. 'After the labours of the day,' says Mr. Irving, 'we often walked to the *Meadows* (a large field intersected by formal alleys of trees, adjoining George's Square), especially in the moonlight nights; and he seemed never weary of repeating the first stanza:

> "The dews of summer night did fall,
> The moon, sweet regent of the sky,
> Silvered the walls of Cumnor Hall,
> And many an oak that grew thereby."'

That

That the impression made by this poem was as clear as it was enduring, we have the best proof in the later composition of 'Kenilworth;' indeed, it was only by an accident that to that grand story the title of Cumnor Hall was not given.

Having referred to Mr. Irving, we may here mention that throughout the whole of their earlier career that gentleman and Walter Scott were inseparable, though in after years they did not see much of each other. There was a great similarity of taste between the young men. They both delighted in legends and romances. They were both prone to indulge the imaginative faculty. They even studied together Italian and Spanish, in order that they might the better enjoy the charming tales of Tasso, Ariosto, and Cervantes. With young Scott, however, it was in Italian and Spanish as it had been in Latin, and as it afterwards became in German—he never took the trouble to make himself an accurate scholar. Enough for him if he could extract the meaning, or enjoy the beauties of his author. For whether it were an ancient or a modern book which came in his way—whether an English, an Italian, a Spanish, a German, or a Latin classic—his sole object in perusing it was to pick out from it the ideas which recommended themselves to his taste or judgment. In no single instance did he dream of making it a means of ascertaining, far less of settling, the niceties of idiom or of grammar. We have specified these five tongues, omitting Greek altogether, for this obvious reason—that Scott never mastered the grammar of that noble language, and had latterly forgotten the very letters.

Imaginative lads are usually as peculiar in the selection of their favourite haunts as in the choice of their pursuits. It was the practice of Walter and his friend Irving to walk sometimes as far as the Salisbury Craigs, and, choosing out some spot on the face of the hill all but inaccessible, to climb up thither, and there sit for hours, either reading together one of the romances with which the circulating library had supplied them, or telling to each other tales, usually of knight-errantry, which had no ending. This habit of wandering grew upon Scott to such an extent, that he occasionally strayed so far, or lost himself so completely, as to be unable to regain his home by the time he was expected. At first his parents suffered much uneasiness on his account. But the practice became by-and-by so frequent, that by degrees they grew accustomed to it, and kept their minds comparatively easy, even when he remained abroad all night.

The most agreeable of Walter's duties, while apprenticed to his father, were those which carried him from time to time into

the

the rural districts where some of Mr. Scott's clients lived. It was thus that he repeatedly visited the border counties, penetrating sometimes as far as the remote valleys of the Cheviots. He studied character there, and began that collection of songs and ballads which grew into the work which first fixed on him the attention of the public. Under similar circumstances he made his earliest acquaintance with the Highlands. Meanwhile his own inner nature was powerfully affected by what he saw and heard. Marching at the head of an armed party, in order to execute some process of *horning*, he lived, as he threaded the defile of the Trossachs, with Rob Roy and Roderic Dhu. The stories told him by old Stewart of Invernahyle entered into his soul, and became a portion of his being.

Young men intended for the humbler branch of the legal profession in Scotland are, equally with aspirants for the advocate's gown, required to attend a course of lectures in the University on Civil law. In 1788 Scott entered the Civil-law class, and the incident wrought a wondrous change in his position and prospects. It renewed for him some desirable acquaintances which he had formed at the High School, and enabled him to contract others not less to his mind. These latter belonged exclusively to the class of youths whom, in 'Redgauntlet,' he designates 'the *Scottish noblesse de la Robe.*' They comprised, among others, William Clerk of Eldin, George Abercrombie (afterwards Lord Abercrombie), Sir Patrick Murray of Ochtertyre, John James Edmonstone of Newton, Mr. Murray of Simprim, and George Cranstoun, later in life Lord Corehouse. All of these, besides being well connected, were young men of personal mark, clever, intelligent, bent on winning distinction, free and engaging in their manners, and strictly honourable. Scott, though at first his appearance told against him, soon broke down by the power and diversity of his talents whatever barrier of restraint stood, at the outset, between them. Mr. Clerk, for example, has left the statement upon record that he was struck, on the first day of Scott's entrance into the Civil-law class-room, with something odd, yet remarkable, in the young man's appearance. What that something was, he could not quite recal; but he remembered telling his companions some time afterwards, that he thought he looked like a *hautboy* player. But, once the ice was thawed, all recollection of the *hautboy* player melted with it; and the uncouth lad was accepted freely and gratefully as one of themselves. 'The liveliness of his conversation, the strange variety of his knowledge, and above all, perhaps, the portentous tenacity of his memory,' riveted more and more the attention of the circle into which he was in due time admitted. Whether it were at

at convivial meetings, or in feats of personal activity and prowess, he showed himself, on all occasions, well able to hold his own.

There were other bonds of union between Scott and his new acquaintances than those enumerated above. They were all fond of making long excursions on foot; so was he, and he taught them to combine with field sports a love of scenery, especially if it were connected with traditions of old romance. They accordingly explored under his guidance all the ruined castles and abbeys within a circuit of many miles round the capital, and found him the best of cicerones. They had adopted, likewise, the prevalent tastes of the day, and discussed literary and scientific subjects with characteristic boldness. For our readers must remember that we are speaking of a time when the Scottish capital was, or was believed by her citizens to be, at the head of the literature and science of the world. Reid had just vacated the chair of metaphysics, that he might be succeeded by Dugald Stewart. Professor Robison stood deservedly high as a mathematician and natural philosopher. Adam Smith, though he taught in Glasgow, passed as much of his time as possible in Edinburgh. Hume had recently died, but Robertson survived. Monboddo and Ferguson were both there; and Home, the author of 'Douglas,' and Mackenzie, the 'Man of Feeling,' contributed, each after his own fashion, to make up that galaxy of light by which the rest of the world was supposed to be dazzled. The young men composing the set of which Scott was a member, though they could not pretend to vie with these stars of the first magnitude, were ambitious of moving in the same orbit. They got up a Debating Club, which they called the Literary Society, and met from time to time to consider points of history, law, general literature, and antiquarian research. In the discussion of all these subjects Scott showed himself eminently well informed. 'He had already dabbled in Anglo-Saxon and the Norse Sagas, but he was deep especially in Fordun and Wyntoun, and all the Scotch chroniclers; and his friends rewarded him by the honourable title of "Duns Scotus."' It is a remarkable fact, however, that his speeches or addresses, though full of knowledge, were by no means brilliant. Indeed Scott, though confessedly one of the most agreeable talkers that ever lived, had very little of the orator about him. Even later in life, when his fame pervaded Europe, and the consciousness of his proper place in the world might have given him confidence, this distrust of his own power as a speaker continued to hang about him; and it was only on rare occasions, when his feelings happened to be strongly worked upon, that he expressed himself eloquently.

Besides this Debating Club, there was another, which appears

to

to have been rather social than literary, and to have consisted of the *élite* of that somewhat miscellaneous body of which the Literary Society was composed. Of that, also, Scott was a member. It held its meetings every Friday evening in a room in Carrubbers Close, whence an adjournment usually took place for supper to an oyster tavern in the neighbourhood. There 'high jinks,' such as are described in 'Guy Mannering,' went on. The Club gradually changed its character, however, as the members grew older, and merged at last into an annual dinner, from which, during thirty years, Scott made a point of never absenting himself.

Such associations as these had a twofold effect upon Walter Scott. They more and more gave dominance to the half-real, half-ideal, views of life which were natural to him; and they disgusted him with that branch of the legal profession for which he was intended. His father wisely and considerately abstained from pressing him on the subject; and Walter, relinquishing to his younger brother his share in the writer's business, became, in 1792, an advocate—or, as we should say in the south, was called to the bar.

Before he assumed the advocate's robe, Scott had been elected into the Speculative Society of Edinburgh. It was, and we believe still continues to be, like the Literary Society of the juniors spoken of elsewhere, a sort of Club, into which gentlemen about to put on the gown are admitted; and in which many, after they have become advocates, continue, for lack of more lucrative employment, to exercise themselves in the arts of eloquence and debate. For this Society he wrote several essays, and entered so heartily into its proceedings, that, soon after becoming a member, he was nominated Secretary and Treasurer. There he made, among other valuable acquaintances, that of Jeffrey, between whom and himself a warm friendship sprang up, which neither differences in political opinion, nor the warmth and earnestness with which each held his own, ever seriously interrupted.

Whether or no Walter Scott, had he laid himself out for briefs, would have become first a successful advocate, and, by and by, a judge, is a question which concerns us little to ask, and still less to answer. He never did lay himself out for briefs; the tastes and habits which he contracted in childhood abode with and controlled him through all his after years. He used whatever legal knowledge he acquired, as he used all his other knowledge, for one purpose. The law became as much idealised to him, as were border ballads and Scandinavian Sagas. He estimated, perhaps above its real value, his social *status* as an advocate, and swept the outer court, like others of his class, day by day looking for business. But he was infinitely more in his element joking and telling

telling stories on the Mountain, than conducting or trying to conduct a case before the judges.* So also, when the Courts rose, he hurried away to the border, or passed from house to house, among the country residences of his allies, combining amusement with antiquarian research. Here is the account which he gives of himself three months after the advocate's gown had been assumed:—

'DEAR WILLIE [CLERK], Rosebank, 10th Sept., 1792.

'. . . . I am lounging about the country here, to speak sincerely, as idle as the day is long. Two companions of mine, brothers of Mr. Walker of Wooden, having come to this country, we have renewed a great intimacy. As they live directly on the opposite bank of the river [the Tweed], we have signals agreed upon by which we concert a plan of operations for the day. They are both officers and very intelligent young fellows, and what is of some consequence, have a brace of fine greyhounds. Yesterday forenoon we killed seven hares, so you may see how plenty the game is with us. I have turned a keen duck-shooter, though my success is not very great; and when wading through the marshes upon this errand, accoutred with the long gun, a jacket, musquito trowsers, and a rough cap, I might well pass for one of my redoubted moss-trooper progenitors, Walter Fire-the-braes, or rather Willie-with-the-bolt-foot. For other outdoor amusement, I have constructed a seat in a large tree which stretches its branches horizontally over the Tweed. This is a favourite situation of mine for reading, especially on a day like this, when the west-wind rocks the branches on which I am perched, and the river rolls its waves below me of a turbid blood colour. I have, moreover, cut an embrasure through which I can fire upon the gulls, herons, or cormorants, as they fly screaming past my nest. To crown all, I have carved an inscription on it, in the ancient runic taste.'

We have alluded elsewhere to Scott's habit of dabbling in various modern languages, for it cannot be said with truth that he ever made himself critically master of one. In 1792 he joined a class for the study of German. The attention of the educated youths of Edinburgh had been drawn to that noble tongue, first by a paper read before the Royal Society by the author of 'The Man of Feeling,' and next by the publication of Lord Woodhouselee's version of Schiller's 'Robbers.' By and by Scott began to translate, and in 1795 produced the most spirited, if not the most correct version, of Bürger's 'Leonore,' that we have in the English language. With this, which may be called the first of his literary efforts, is mixed up an event in

* The Mountain was a particular corner in the outer house, where barristers without briefs congregated, and amused each other and all who came near them with witty talk. Scott soon became as remarkable in this place, as he had been at the High School, for his stories.

his

his personal history, over which Mr. Lockhart has judged it expedient to throw a veil of mystery, for which, as it appears to us, there was no real occasion. Not by us, however, shall secrets be revealed, which were considered worth keeping twenty years ago, though to tell the tale, at least in outline, seems to be a necessity.

For some time after he had begun to associate exclusively with the members of the Club and the Speculative Society, Scott continued to be as careless, not to say slovenly, in his attire, as he used to be when a school-boy and a writer's apprentice. All at once his habits changed in this respect, and he became a well-dressed young man—a squire, as his companions pronounced him, of dames. He had fallen in love with a young lady whom he encountered at the church door, and convoyed to her own home, sheltered from the rain by his umbrella. His family and hers were not on any terms of intimacy. Mr. Scott happened, indeed, to be her father's solicitor; but the man of business did not pretend, probably did not desire, to be reckoned among the familiars of his client. Indeed, so honourably sensitive on that head was the Writer, that he no sooner observed how matters were tending with the young people, than he considered himself bound to put the lady's father on his guard. The warning was well received and made light of, and the acquaintance went on, more especially as young Scott made his way, as he soon afterwards did, into the set of which the young lady's brother was a member. Hence it came to pass that he met the young lady herself frequently, not in Edinburgh only, but in her own and other country houses, and that she, being addicted to poetry and romance, received him frankly and kindly as often as he came.

This sort of intimacy was kept up for years, throughout the whole interval, indeed, between 1792 and 1796; and Scott regarding it as he regarded all things else, through the medium of his own imagination, flattered himself that his passion was reciprocated. No word escaped him, however, to the lady herself, either in conversation or writing, indicative of the state of his own feelings. He resembled in this respect the most bashful of the bashful lovers described in his novels. He told his secret to many of his friends, and among others to Miss Cranstoun, afterwards Countess of Purgstall, but to the object of his devotion he said nothing. It is worthy of remark, however, that neither the passion itself, nor the secrecy in which it was nourished, exercised the slightest untoward influence over his character. As first love is apt to do with such as him it deepened in him the poetic temperament; but it made him neither less industrious

industrious nor less manly. The interval between 1792 and 1796 was, it will be remembered, one of great political agitation in Scotland. The rebound of the French revolution had been felt there as much as in other European countries, and society divided itself into two classes — the friends of order and the champions of confusion. Scott, as was to be expected, sided heart and soul with the former. He took a prominent part in many a row which had something else than the pleasure of breaking heads for its object. As a special constable he drove riotous mobs from the streets, just as in his private capacity he helped to clear the theatre of Irish and other democrats who refused to uncover when 'God Save the King' was sung. And having done these things he returned with increased zest to his business in court, his private studies, and the society of his friends. We find him, in 1793, defending in the General Assembly a minister charged before that court with habitual drunkenness and indecency. He failed to bring off his client, whose character seems to have been indefensible. But he had contrived, in hunting for evidence through the scenery of Guy Mannering, to lay up innumerable pictures, and to find various names, among others that of Macguffog, of which excellent use was made in due season. Just before this trial came on, he had set off with Adam Ferguson, a class-fellow in the High School, and a friend for life, on a tour through some of the finest districts in Stirlingshire, Perthshire, and Forfarshire. In the course of this tour he halted in succession at Tullibody, Newton, Cambusmore, Craighall, and Meigle. Each supplied him with materials for future use. From Mr. Abercrombie, of Tullibody, the father of Sir Ralph, and the grandfather of his own friend of the Mountain, Mr., afterwards Lord Abercrombie, he received an account of certain incidents which occurred to that gentleman, all of which we find detailed in the narrative of the Baron of Bradwardine's dealings with his troublesome neighbours, including the visit to the cavern of Donald Bean Lean, with its curious accompaniments. At Newton,* a villa on the banks of the Teith, the grounds of which run up to the stately ruins of Doune Castle, he heard how John Home, and other prisoners to the Highland army, had escaped from that fortalice. He did not forget the story when he sat down to write 'Waverley.' From Cambusmore he made himself familiar with every rood of the landscape through which the scenes in the 'Lady of the Lake' are carried;—not ex-

* Newton has changed, since those days, both its name and its ownership. It is now the property of John Campbell, Esq., by whom the present beautiful château was built: and has become Inverardoch.

cepting

cepting those which are glanced at, as Fitz-James pursues his fiery ride from the banks of Loch-Vennachar, after the duel with Roderick Dhu, to Stirling Castle. Craighall, the seat of the Ratterays, supplemented by a feature or two from Bruntsfield House and Ravelstone, became for him *Tully-Veolan*; and Meigle brought him into contact with more than one Balmawhapple, as well as with Old Mortality, whom he found in the flesh, scraping, under the more familiar name of Robert Paterson, the moss from the tombs of the martyrs, in the churchyard of Dunottar. Thus, in town and country, at his desk, or breathing the pure air of heaven, his mind appears to have been continually busy, and busy in such a way as to render the world of living men a thousand times less real to him than the world which he was creating.

Doubtless it was, to some extent at least, the spirit of chivalry which was in him, that induced him about this time to take a leading part in getting up a regiment of yeomanry cavalry in the Lothians. Already England was threatened with invasion, and corps of volunteer infantry turned out everywhere. Edinburgh itself produced a most efficient battalion, in which barristers served as privates, and judges as field-officers. Scott's lameness prevented his enrolling himself in that battalion, as his brothers had done. But finding an example set by the Londoners, he moved the Duke of Buccleuch, the Lord Lieutenant of the county, to apply for permission to embody some squadrons of light horse; and the permission being granted, Scott at once took service with that force in the capacity of Lieutenant and Quartermaster. His strong black charger, which he named Leonore, was ridden in many a day's training on Portobello sands, not without a yearning desire on the part of the rider that he might one day be enabled to lead a charge against a real enemy.

Thus far the tide of fortune may be said to have rolled with a steady current in Scott's favour. He was in fair practice at the bar, considering his age and standing. The advocates had appointed him one of their librarians. He was rapidly establishing a good name, as a man of genius and great research. He was about to experience his first sorrow, and it was a bitter one. Encouraged in part by the success of his translation, in part by the partial assurances of his friend, Miss Cranstoun, he made up his mind to tell his tale of love; and finding himself under the same roof with the object of his affections, he besought her to give him her heart, and was rejected. She had no heart to give. Another had it in his keeping, and he was one of Walter's dearest friends. It would be ungenerous, if it were possible, to depict his feelings on that occasion

occasion. This much, however, we are bound to say, that he overmastered them with a power of will which is marvellous; and, carrying in his soul a grief which never died, he never allowed it—no, not even for a day—to stand between him and the manly exercise of his faculties. He quitted the house, made his way into Perthshire, and threw himself, with apparently increased zeal, into the researches which were to him at once business and recreation, while, strange to say, only one short poem by his hand survives to tell that such an incident ever befel him. There is, however, no doubt that there are traces of her in the heroines of the 'Lay,' 'Rokeby,' and 'Redgauntlet.'

The translation of 'Leonore,' though executed in 1794, was not published till two years afterwards. Under the pressure of disappointment, he took eagerly to composition, and in October of 1796, he made his first appearance as an author, printing, in a handsome quarto volume, this, with another of Bürger's ballads, 'The Wild Huntsman.' In the publication of this work he was greatly assisted by Mrs. Scott, of Harden, the daughter of Count Brühl, of Martkirchen, long Saxon Minister at the Court of St. James's, who appears to have been a very charming, as she was undoubtedly a highly accomplished and beautiful woman. To her, soon after her arrival at Merton, Walter got introduced; and, seeing under his then somewhat awkward exterior marks of high genius, she at once took him by the hand, and proved in many ways serviceable to him.

The translation, though much and deservedly admired, proved a failure as a mercantile adventure. Many other versions of the same poems were in the market, and Scott's, though undoubtedly not inferior to the best, never exhausted a single edition. This in no degree daunted his courage or damped his energy. He resumed his search after border legends and border ballads, and succeeded by degrees in acquiring a vast and valuable amount of both. He was earnestly engaged in this pursuit, which was relieved, now by attendance in the parliament-house, now by cavalry exercises, when he saw for the first time, and became at once attracted by, the lady whom not long afterwards he made his wife. The story of this courtship would be hard to understand, did not all experience vouch for the fact, that the heart suffering under a disappointment in its affections turns instinctively to some other object for relief. So at least it certainly was with Scott; for within less than a year after receiving his wound, he went with his brother and Adam Ferguson to the little Border watering-place of Gilsland, and encountered there a lady on horseback, who rode well, sat gracefully, and appeared to be very beautiful. All the three young men were struck, and they

they managed the same night to get introduced to her at a ball. She proved to be a Miss Carpenter or Charpentier, the daughter of a widow lady, whose husband, a French employé, had died during the revolution, after sending his family to England. The guardian of this lady and of her brother, who went to India in the civil service, was the Marquess of Downshire. Scott had known her barely a month or six weeks when he proposed. The Marquess gave his approval, and, on the 24th Dec. 1797, the young couple were married in the parish church of St. Mary, Carlisle.

Such was the abrupt beginning of a union which lasted through many years; and, in spite of the most marked dissimilarity of tastes between husband and wife, proved, upon the whole, to be a fairly happy one. It seems to have been peculiarly so at the outset. Scott took his bride to lodgings, while a house in Castle Street was preparing for them, and introduced her to his family and friends. The family soon took to her, with one exception. His friends, and especially the Club, were charmed with her. She made a capital hostess at his small evening parties, and would have been delighted to go with him to the play every night in the week. And here we may observe, once for all, that for dramatic performances, and the companionship of clever actors, Scott had the keenest relish. Few men saw more of him, or were deeper in his confidence, than Daniel Terry. The Siddonses male and female were his friends, and Matthews shared his hospitality on every possible occasion. But Scott believed himself to be now in a position to indulge that love of the country and its pleasures which was inherent in him. Reserving his house in Castle Street for a town residence during term time, he hired a cottage near Lasswade, which he fitted up with much taste. It may be doubted whether his enjoyment of life was ever more pure, more innocent, or more rational, than during the early years of his residence there. Lasswade stands in the midst of scenery than which few districts in the lowlands of Scotland can present anything more beautiful. It is surrounded at short distances by gentlemen's seats, which were in those days inhabited, among others, by the Duke of Buccleuch, the grandfather of the present duke; by Lord Melville, the father of Scott's friends Robert and William Dundas; by the 'Man of Feeling,' Mr. Mackenzie; and by Lord Woodhouselee, one of Scott's ancient familiars. All these threw open their doors to receive the rising man of genius and his bride; while his own more humble roof gave shelter and entertainment to old friends who seldom failed once or twice in every week to visit him from Edinburgh. Moreover at Lasswade he

may

may be considered as having for the first time, and in a marked manner, surrendered himself to the sway of his ruling passion. The circumstances were these:—

Seventy years ago few living writers stood higher in public estimation than Matthew Lewis. The 'Monk' was then in the zenith of its glory; and of 'Alonzo the Brave' and 'Durandarte' critics and connoisseurs could not say enough. The author of these famous performances came to Scotland, and Scott was gratified beyond measure with the attentions which Lewis paid him. They met in Edinburgh; they met at Dalkeith. He was Scott's guest and the guest of the yeomanry, when it turned out for permanent duty at Mussleburgh. All this was the result of some communications which had passed in London between the great *littérateur* and Scott's friend William Erskine; in the course of which Erskine gave to Lewis a copy of Scott's version of 'Leonore' to read. Lewis, though robust neither in mind nor body, was not a fool. He saw at once the great merit of the performance, and being then engaged in collecting materials for his 'Tales of Wonder,' he proposed, through Erskine, that Scott should become a contributor to that work. Accepting the proposal, Scott was ready in a short time with the ballads which he had promised. Lewis, however, was not ready, and the publication of the 'Tales of Wonder,' hung fire. They did not indeed make their appearance till 1801. This chafed Scott a little, which Lewis perceiving, encouraged him to go on with the translation of Goethe's 'Goetz von Berlichingen, of the Iron Hand;' and negotiated the sale of it as a separate copyright for 25*l.* Another long pause ensued, during which Scott accidentally renewed the acquaintance of James Ballantyne, of whom as a school-fellow of his at Kelso we have elsewhere spoken. James had become the proprietor as well as the printer of a weekly newspaper in Kelso, and hearing that Scott was on a visit at Rosebank, he called upon him. His object was to propose that Scott, whose name was high among his friends as a man of talent, should supply the 'Kelso Mail' occasionally with a few paragraphs on some legal questions of the day. Scott assented; and, carrying his article himself to the printing-office, he took along with it some of the pieces which he had prepared for Lewis's collection. With these, especially with the 'Morlachian fragment after Goethe,' Ballantyne was delighted, expressing great regret that Lewis's book was so slow to make its appearance. The conversation went on, and Scott before parting threw out a casual observation, that he wondered his old friend did not try to get some bookseller's work to keep his types in play during the rest of the week. The obvious answer came that Ballantyne had no acquaintance with *the trade* in Edinburgh, nor any means of

establishing it. 'Well,' said Scott, 'you have been praising my little ballads; suppose you print off a dozen copies or so of as many as will make a pamphlet, sufficient to let my Edinburgh acquaintances judge of your skill for themselves?' The suggestion was at once acted upon. Twelve copies of 'Willie and Ellen,' as many of the 'Fire King,' the 'Chase,' and of a few more were thrown off, with the title 'Apology for Tales of Terror.' We give what follows in the words of Scott's loving biographer:—

'This first specimen of a press, afterwards so celebrated, pleased Scott: and he said to Ballantyne, "I have been for years collecting old Border Ballads, and I think I could, with little trouble, put together such a selection from them as might make a neat little volume, to sell for four or five shillings. I will talk to some of the booksellers about it when I get to Edinburgh, and if the thing goes on, you shall be the printer. Ballantyne highly relished the proposal; and the result of this little experiment changed wholly the course of his worldly fortunes, as well as of his friend's.'

Scott returned home full of the plan, and was shortly afterwards rendered doubly free to follow without misgiving the bent of his own inclinations. The office of sheriff-depute of Selkirkshire became vacant by the death of an early ally of his own, a Mr. Plummer, of Middlestead, a scholar and an antiquary, who had entered with zeal into all Scott's border researches. The community of tastes between the two men may have had some part in suggesting to the Duke of Buccleuch, that a better successor to Mr. Plummer than Scott could not be found. Be that as it may, the Duke's influence was used to obtain the vacant sheriffship for his clansman; and Lord Melville, with whom then rested the distribution of government patronage in Scotland, readily acceded to the Duke's request. The result was that on the 16th of Dec., 1799, he was gazetted to the sheriffship, and added thereby just 300*l.* to his annual income.

Easy now in his circumstances, Scott threw himself with exceeding ardour into literary pursuits. His was not, however, the mind of a mere dreamer or poet; at all events his dreams were at once more vivid, and in one sense far more practical, than fill the brains of poets in general. He was ambitious of rising to more than poetic fame in the world, and the measures for achieving that end which occurred to him at this moment were most original. He conceived the idea, not alone of establishing James Ballantyne as a printer in Edinburgh, but of himself becoming a partner in the concern.

'Three branches of printing are quite open in Edinburgh,' he writes, 'all of which I am well convinced you have both the ability and

and inclination to unite in your own person. The first is that of an editor of a newspaper, which shall contain something of an uniform historical deduction of events distinct from the farrago of detached and unconnected plagiarisms from the London paragraphs of "The Sun." Perhaps it might be possible (and Gillon * has promised to make inquiry about it) to treat with the proprietors of some established paper—suppose the "Caledonian Mercury"—and we would all struggle to obtain for it some celebrity. To this might be added a Monthly Magazine and Caledonian Annual Register, if you will; for both of which with the excellent literary assistance which Edinburgh at present affords, there is a fair opening. The next object would naturally be the execution of Session papers, the best paid work which a printer undertakes, and of which, I dare say, you would soon have a considerable share; for as you make it your business to superintend the proofs yourself, your education and ability would ensure your employers against the gross and provoking blunders which the poor composers are often obliged to submit to. The publication of works, either ancient or modern, opens a third fair field for ambition. The only gentleman who attempts anything in that way is in very bad health, nor can I, at any rate, compliment either the accuracy or the execution of his press. I believe it is well understood that with equal attention an Edinburgh press would have superior advantages even to those of the Metropolis.'

This is a bold plan, and the means of carrying it into effect are scarcely less so.

'In the meanwhile the "Kelso Mail" might be so arranged as to be still a source of some advantage to you; and I dare say, if wanted, pecuniary assistance might be procured to assist you, at the outset, *either upon terms of a share or* otherwise.'

It was clearly of pecuniary assistance *on terms of a share*, that Scott was already thinking; and before long steps were taken to convert the vision into a reality.

Meanwhile Scott went forward with the preparation of the first work which was to make his name known on both sides of the Tweed. 'During seven successive years he made a *raid*, as he called it, into Liddesdale, exploring every rivulet to its source, and every ruined *peel* from foundation to battlement.' Wherever he heard of a ballad he hunted it up, either in person or through the instrumentality of assistants, almost all of whom were destined themselves to acquire in after years more or less of distinction in the world. Leyden was one of these, a man born in a shepherd's cottage, who, when the Edinburgh philosophers found him out, astonished them all by the extent and variety of his knowledge. He was a frequenter of an ob-

* A writer in Edinburgh, a man of great natural ability, of whose judgment Scott entertained a high opinion, but whom habits of intemperance quite broke down.

scure bookshop in the old town, kept by a bookseller, by name Constable, who very good-naturedly allowed the raw poor youth of nineteen to come and read whatever his shelves contained, and they contained many treasures. Leyden was introduced to Scott by Richard Heber, an accidental visitor to Edinburgh, but already one of Scott's correspondents, and a collector wherever he went of literary curiosities. Him Scott found to be of the greatest possible use, and he was happy in being able to pay back the obligation, while at the same time he benefited society by contributing, not long afterwards, to the start of so remarkable a man. Leyden, we need scarcely add, died too soon in India, just as he had established a reputation there second only to that of Sir William Jones.

Another of Scott's assistants was James Hogg, the Ettrick shepherd, a genius without conduct, whom everybody admired in his writings, but whom nobody could serve. Hogg knew or affected to know every ballad that was ever sung and every story that was ever told on the Scottish border. He was exceedingly adroit likewise in filling up blanks and supplying sometimes a head and sometimes a tail-piece, just as it was wanted. Scott did his best to serve him also, but failed. Hogg could not manage his own affairs, yet was for ever urgent to be allowed to manage the affairs of others. He was to his employer—if we may so speak of Scott—alternately obsequious, ridiculous, and insolent. Take, for example, Lockhart's account of the Shepherd's first dinner with Scott:—

'When Hogg entered the drawing-room, Mrs. Scott, being at the time in a delicate state of health, was reclining on a sofa. The Shepherd, after being presented and making his best bow, forthwith took possession of another sofa placed opposite to hers, and stretched himself thereupon at all his length; for, as he said afterwards, "I thought I could never do wrong to copy the lady of the house." As his dress at this period was precisely that in which any ordinary herdsman attends cattle to the market, and as his hands, moreover, bore most legible marks of a recent sheep-smearing, the lady of the house did not observe with perfect equanimity the novel usage to which her chintz was exposed. The Shepherd, however, remarked nothing of all this—dined heartily and drank freely, and, by jest, anecdote, and song, afforded plentiful merriment to the more civilized part of the company. As the liquor operated, his familiarity increased and strengthened; from "Mr. Scott," he advanced to "Sherra," and thence to "Scott," "Walter," and "Wattie," until at supper he fairly convulsed the whole party by addressing Mrs. Scott as "Charlotte."'

Poor Hogg had all the elements of a poet about him, and his 'Kilmeny' may compare with any story of the kind in the

the language. But how was it possible essentially to serve a man who was always asking, always misspending what he got, and withal so touchy as to address to his benefactor, who had somehow offended him, a letter which began 'D—d sir,' and ended 'Yours with disgust'?

A third of these assistants cannot be passed without special notice, for he grew, as he deserved to grow, into the condition of one of Scott's dearest friends. William Laidlaw, the son of a tenant farmer on the Yarrow, was gifted, like all the other members of his family, with an amiable disposition, excellent memory, and a clear understanding. He had in his boyhood gathered up a store of old songs and tales, all of which he gave to Scott; and if a blank appeared in any which Scott received from other quarters, he was generally able to fill it up, either from his own recollections or from knowing the place and the people among whom it had its origin. William Laidlaw never ceased to enjoy a large share of Scott's friendship, and was, as we shall see by-and-by, among the few who were present and contributed to Scott's ease at his death.

At last, in 1802, 'The Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border,' the result of so many journeys through the glens and valleys of the Border country, made its appearance. It was printed at the press of James Ballantyne, still a denizen of Kelso, and carried, so to speak, public favour by storm. Congratulations poured in upon the compiler from all quarters. George Ellis, George Canning, Bishop Percy—even cantankerous Joseph Ritson himself—all wrote to express their strong admiration of the performance; and Lewis, notwithstanding its throwing into the shade his 'Tales of Wonder,' joined in the chorus of applause. All this occurred while as yet only the two first volumes were in the hands of the public. When the third appeared, and by-and-by the metrical romance of 'Sir Tristrem,' the success of the undertaking became complete. Scott took his place at once in the front rank of literature. He could command his own price for the copyright of a separate work, and free access to the most remunerative of existing periodicals. The copyright of the 'Minstrelsy' brought him 578*l.* The 'Edinburgh Review,' just started under the guidance of Mr. Jeffrey, and published by Mr. Constable, wooed him as a contributor. It was conducted then, as it is conducted now, on principles of moderation in politics, and Scott readily supplied the pages of some of its earlier numbers with valuable articles. About the same time he visited London, Mrs. Scott bearing him company. Heber and Mackintosh met him with open arms. So did William Stuart Rose, Rogers, and others whom we need not stop to particularise. He was the guest of

of his friend George Ellis for some days at Sunninghill, and, returning home by Oxford, was guided over that city of palaces by Reginald Heber, a newly-made Bachelor of Arts, and the happy winner of the Newdigate prize.

The years 1802, 3, 4, were seasons of grave alarm both in England and Scotland. The Scots expected to be invaded from Flushing or one of the northern ports of the continent, and over and over again the volunteers were called out to meet the coming danger. Not once when the bugle sounded was Scott absent from the roll-call; indeed he rode, on one occasion, a hundred miles in four-and-twenty hours to overtake his regiment, his gallant black charger carrying him all the way. But Scott's zeal as a soldier interfered, or was supposed by the Lord Lieutenant of Roxburghshire to interfere, with his duties as sheriff; more especially as the cottage at Lasswade was outside his proper jurisdiction. Scott positively refused to sheath 'the voluntary blade;' but he compromised the difference with his chief by removing himself and his belongings in 1804 from the banks of the Esk to the banks of the Tweed. The house of Ashestiel, belonging to a cousin of his own, who was absent in India, was vacant, and he took a lease of it. In every point of view the change of residence proved advantageous to him. It brought him into a country endeared to his earliest recollections and pregnant for him with home associations. It gave him, indeed, a scant neighbourhood, more scant than is to be found there now. But the few families within reach included the Pringles and the Earl of Dalkeith, as often as for business or pleasure he might find it convenient to set up his staff for a while at Bowhill. On the whole, therefore, as soon as the *désagréments* of change were surmounted, Scott was well pleased with the step which he had taken, as indeed he had every reason to be.

Scott's preparations for removing to Ashestiel were all complete when his uncle Robert died, bequeathing to him the villa of Rosebank, where in youth so many happy days had been spent. He was not tempted by that incident to forego his own plans; but sold the place for five thousand pounds, and looked about for land in which to invest the money. For his great ambition was to become an owner of the soil. Meanwhile, however, he was hard at work upon the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel,' which grew out of a ballad begun some years previously, in order to gratify the amiable Countess of Dalkeith. In the autumn of this year he completed it, Messrs. Longman being the publishers, and Ballantyne the printer. The immediate gain to him on the first impression was only 169*l.* 6*s.* This was the result of what is called division of

of profits. But a second edition being speedily called for, Scott was offered 500*l.* for the copyright, and closed with the proposal. Had he added that sum to his uncle's legacy, as well as an additional hundred pounds with which the successful publishers subsequently presented him, and purchased with the whole the small estate of Broad Meadows, how different the course of his existence might have been! The lands lay over against the ruins of Newark, on the north bank of the Yarrow; and often, while the 'Lay' was yet in manuscript, he rode round and surveyed them with a longing eye. But soon after the publication of that poem Ballantyne, who had meantime removed to Edinburgh, wrote to say that, unless additional funds were procured, his venture must fail; and Scott, who had already pledged his credit to obtain loans for the house, consented to become a partner in the concern, and to pay down 5000*l.*, as the price of one-third of the property. So was taken the first step in a course, destined to terminate as we shall see by-and-by.

The act which in its results operated so fatally upon his fortunes was not forced on by that ignorance of affairs, or indifference to them, which is assumed to be the characteristic of the poetic temperament. In his own way—a most mistaken way, as the event proved in many respects—Scott was as shrewd a man of business as ever lived. He believed that the printing concern might be made enormously lucrative, and he embarked in it, having laid his plans for realising this belief. But he did more. Before he would entirely withdraw from the practice of the law, he looked round for some berth which more effectually than the Sheriffship might secure him against the risk of absolute poverty, or even of a compulsory economy, in the event of his speculations failing. The Scotch Bar still retains some prizes of this sort, though they are less numerous than they once were. Such are the clerkships of the Supreme Court at Edinburgh, of which three out of five still exist, and of which the salary, now fixed, though formerly paid in fees, amounts to 1300*l.* a year. For the reversion of one of these, which was expected soon to fall vacant, Scott applied, and, after a delay as brief as circumstances would allow, the place was secured to him. To the emoluments of the office he did not immediately succeed. The aged occupant held on longer than was expected; and Scott had for some years all the trouble without the pay. But the certainty that sooner or later he should succeed to a good and fixed income made his mind easy. 'He closed his fee-book, never to open it again,' and with all the energy which belonged to his energetic nature bent himself to keep the printing presses busy, and to realise out of them a fortune. Still affecting to treat literature rather

rather as an amusement than as a profession, to make it his staff, as he himself said, and not his crutch, he projected and set on foot such an amount of literary labour as had never before been thought of, much less undertaken, by any one man. His influence, be it remembered, in all branches of the publishing trade was immense. Publishers and authors alike seemed ready to act on his suggestions. Any project recommended by him was sure to be favourably regarded, especially if hopes were held out of his taking personal interest in promoting it; and his judgment in regard to what would suit the public taste was generally sound. His first scheme was the production of a complete set of British Poets, edited by himself. Constable, now beginning to rise in the world, was to be the publisher; Ballantyne and Co. of course the printers of the work. Ellis suggested a similar proceeding with the Chroniclers, and Scott agreed. His friend, Mr. Thomas Thomson, talked of bringing out a New Edition of 'Clarendon,' and the printing of that was likewise promised to the Ballantynes. Though none of these undertakings ever came to completion, enough was done with each of them to keep the types busy, and to necessitate the raising of a fresh loan, Scott himself becoming security. Yet all was done under a cloud. Scott never appeared to the outer world to have any pecuniary motives for bestirring himself as he did to keep the press going. He gave out, freely enough, that he would have nothing to say to any work unless the Ballantynes were commissioned to print it, but the sole reason ever assigned was that he preferred his friend's typography to that of all the trade besides. We quite agree with Mr. Lockhart in the judgment which he passes on these transactions.

'It is an old saying that wherever there is a secret there must be something wrong, and dearly did he pay the penalty for the mystery in which he had chosen to involve the transaction. It was his rule, from the beginning, that whatever he wrote or edited must be printed at that press; and had he catered for it only as author and editor, all would have been well; but had the booksellers known his direct pecuniary interest in keeping up and extending the occupation of those types, they would have taken into account his lively imagination and sanguine temperament, as well as his taste and judgment, and considered far more deliberately than they too often did, his multifarious recommendations of new literary schemes, coupled though these were with some dim understanding, that if the Ballantyne press were employed his own literary skill would be at his friend's disposal for the general superintendence of the undertaking.'

With all this we cordially agree; yet let it not be forgotten, in extenuation of the fault, that at the period when Scott connected himself

himself with the printing-office of the Ballantynes, public opinion in the profession was utterly opposed to mixing up the profession of an advocate with trade in any shape whatever. He could not, therefore, avow the partnership without losing caste. But why do that which could not be avowed, and why go farther in the same direction, as we shall find by-and-by that he imprudently did?

In the year 1805, when the 'Lay' had fairly established itself in popular favour, Scott's life as a barrister may be said to have merged in that of an author. Ashestiel became, more than the cottage at Lasswade had ever been, the home of a busy literary man, and the resort of literary strangers. The duties of a sheriff in Scotland, though important, are not usually severe, and these he discharged faithfully; making himself as much beloved among those to whom he administered the law, as among his own associates. But letters filled without engrossing his mind; and in order that he might give to them the increased attention that was necessary, without taking a less prominent part in society than he used to do, he changed his habits, and instead of sitting up far into the night, rose early in the morning.

'He rose,' says his friend, Mr. Skene, in a letter to Mr. Lockhart, 'at five o'clock; lit his own fire, and shaved and dressed with great deliberation; for he was a very martinet in all but the mere coxcombries of the toilet; not abhorring effeminate dandyism itself as much as the slightest approach to personal slovenliness, or even those bed-gown and slipper tricks, as he called them, in which literary men are so apt to indulge. Arrayed in his shooting-jacket, or whatever dress he meant to wear till dinner-time, he was seated at his desk by six o'clock, all his papers ranged before him in the most accurate order, and his books of reference marshalled around him on the floor; while at least one favoured dog lay watching his eye, just beyond the line of circumvallation. By the time the family assembled for breakfast, between nine and ten, he had done enough (in his own language) to break the neck of the day's work. After breakfast a couple of hours more were given to his solitary work; and by noon he was, as he used to say, his own man. When the weather was bad he would labour incessantly all the morning; but the general rule was to be out and on horseback by one o'clock at the latest; while if any more distant excursion had been proposed over night he was ready to set out on it by ten; his occasional rainy days of unremitting study forming, as he said, a fund in his favour, out of which he was entitled to draw for accommodation, whenever the sun shone with special brightness.'

Mr. Skene describes Scott as he lived at Ashestiel. The description applies with equal accuracy to his manner of life at Abbotsford. There, indeed, when not constrained by politeness or

or inclination to be the guide of his guests to points of interest in the neighbourhood, he found his own amusement chiefly in superintending the laying out of his grounds, thinning the woods, marking the limits of the plantations, or watching, or it might be himself taking part in, the work of planting and measuring. In all this his constant companion and assistant was Tom Purdie, a remarkable man, whom he found a poacher, and made the most faithful of bailiffs.

Another rule Scott laid down for himself from which he never deviated. Every letter which he received was answered on the same day; indeed nothing short of this could have enabled him to keep abreast of his correspondence, which was always very large, and became latterly oppressive. Nor in noticing his peculiarities must we forget his exceeding love both of horses and dogs. So long as he served in the yeomanry, he never let a morning pass without visiting his charger, and feeding him with his own hand, and this before the work of the day began. As to the dogs—whether it were Camp a bull-terrier, and long a special favourite, or Douglas and Percy his greyhounds, or noble Maida his stag-hound, whose monument still attracts the notice of the visitor as he enters the hall at Abbotsford—for all these in succession, and the countless terriers their contemporaries, a window of his study always stood open, by which they might pass to and fro as the humour took them.

Of all field sports Scott was fond; but his favourite was latterly coursing. An otter hunt also had special charms for him, as his description of one in 'Guy Mannering' shows. Nor did it fail to increase his enjoyment if, in following the hounds, he found himself called upon to dash over difficult fords, and prick through morasses. As we are on the subject of Scott's personal habits, it may be as well to state here how he habitually bore himself in the domestic circle, strictly so-called. His wife, with many agreeable and amiable qualities, never was to him, nor could she be, a companion. She was proud of his genius, and jealous of any attacks that might be made upon his renown. Indeed she never forgave Jeffrey his article on 'Marmion' in the 'Edinburgh Review;' and could not help showing what she felt, when, immediately after the appearance of the critique, the author of it dined at Scott's table. Still Scott was sincerely attached to her, and his diary shows that her death, though long expected, affected him very deeply. His children, on the other hand—and he had four, two sons and two daughters—twined themselves round the core of his heart. In their infancy he seems to have taken comparatively little notice of them; but as soon as they were old enough to understand what he said, he delighted in

in having them with him, and devoted to them much time and tender care. Like their mute companions, the dogs, they had free admission to his study at all hours, when he would lay down his pen, take them on his knee, repeat to them a ballad or tell a story, kiss them, and send them away again. From a very early age they were accustomed to dine with their father and mother. Their education he conducted in a somewhat desultory manner. The girls, when old enough, were placed under a governess, selected far more because of good sense and moral worth, than on account of showy accomplishments; and the boys went to school, as he had himself done—the eldest passing thence into a cavalry regiment, the youngest entering Oxford and taking a degree, preparatory to his admission into the Foreign Office. But till they were ripe for systematic teaching he was himself their instructor; the instruction being communicated much more frequently by oral tradition than through books. His tales, on what are called week days, were taken from the annals of their own and other countries; on Sunday the children listened in like manner to stories, but they were stories taken from sacred history. And here, by the way, we may observe that with Scott, whether at Abbotsford or in Edinburgh, Sunday was always a day of rest and recreation. In the country, however full of company the house might be, he invariably announced his intention, at breakfast, of reading prayers at eleven o'clock; and he added, frankly and without affectation of shyness, 'And I expect every lady and gentleman to be present.' There usually followed the reading of the Liturgy a sermon by some great divine—not unfrequently Jeremy Taylor—after which guests and members of the household were alike free to stroll wherever fancy led them. He himself, usually attended by a select few, wandered amid his woods, and poured out to a delighted audience endless tales and legends connected with the locality. When in Edinburgh two or three of his oldest and most familiar friends invariably dined with him. He called these his 'dinners without the silver dishes,' and the evenings were usually lightened by reading aloud a play from Shakespeare, or a new work by one of the favourite poets of the day.

Scott's generosity to his less fortunate brother authors was extreme; indeed it often degenerated into weakness. Not content with giving them money, he would tax his judgment to discover something meritorious in every manuscript which they submitted to him. Other methods also, characteristic of himself, he took of serving them. For example, having been invited, during one of his earlier visits to London, to dine with Caroline, Princess of Wales, at Montague House, and being

requested

requested to repeat some of his own unpublished verses, he replied that he really could not recollect any which would be worthy of her Royal Highness's notice: but that, if allowed, he would repeat a ballad by an obscure author of whose talents he entertained the highest admiration. The desired consent being given he recited some beautiful verses from a collection of poems by Hogg: and accomplished his purpose by getting the Princess to become a subscriber to the volume, which was soon afterwards published.

Thus far we have followed Walter Scott's fortunes closely, as it were chronologically, while he fought his way to fame. What we have to say of him after he attained the proudest position which literature has ever won for its votary in his own lifetime, must necessarily be more brief. The three years between the autumn of 1804 and the spring of 1808, he spent partly at Ashestiel, partly in Edinburgh. It was a season at once of great enjoyment and increasing labour. Already his acquaintance was sought not only by his neighbours of every degree, but by almost every man or woman distinguished in literature and art throughout the United Kingdom. In 1808 'Marmion' made its appearance, bringing with it an immense accession of renown to the author. In spite of an ungenerous critique in the 'Edinburgh Review' (which had by this time become a strong party publication, in fierce hostility to the government and its foreign as well as domestic policy) that noble poem achieved at once boundless popularity, and placed Scott at the head of the living literature of England, and we may safely add of Europe. He was not rendered giddy by the position; far less was he induced to relax in his exertions. Its effect was the very opposite, though, in some respects, his literary zeal took a new direction. For example, guided mainly, no doubt, by the honest desire to counteract what he regarded as a pernicious influence, though in part, perhaps, by indignation at the personal treatment which he had received in its pages, he lent himself willingly to a proposal, which was made in 1808, of setting up a Quarterly Journal in opposition to the 'Edinburgh Review.' The Quarterly Journal, which he assisted in setting afloat, was, as we need scarcely observe, the same in which these sentences are printed. But its origin was entirely due to the energy and sagacity of the late Mr. Murray, who had already written to Mr. Canning upon the subject, and then proceeded in person to Ashestiel to secure the co-operation of Scott. His proposal was heartily received by Scott, who promised his own assistance and that of his friends. Scott wrote three articles in the first number, which appeared in the beginning of 1809, and

and from time to time contributed many other papers, which are collected in his prose works.*

At this time, also, a new project entered into his head, and unfortunately for himself and all concerned, he made preparations to realise it. Mr. Constable, the publisher of the 'Edinburgh Review,' had fallen out with the Ballantynes. He was, moreover, an abettor of the mischievous principles of his own journal, if not formally professing them; and these two things constituted, in Scott's eyes, a grave offence against morals. He determined to make war upon the Whig bookseller by setting up a publishing house, in opposition to him, at his own door. Yet at the moment when this scheme took possession of him he was under engagements to different publishing houses, the bare enumeration of which might well astound the most industrious of authors. For one he had undertaken to bring out a complete edition of British novelists, another made arrangements with him to collect the works and write a life of Dryden, a third had engaged him to prepare a new edition of Ralph Sadler's 'State Papers,' and of the earlier volumes of 'Somers's Tracts,' while to Constable himself he was pledged to a republication of Swift's works.

'Conversing with Scott many years afterwards about the tumult of engagements in which he was then involved, he said: "Ay, it was enough to tear me to pieces; but there was a wonderful exhilaration about it all. My blood was kept at fever pitch; I felt as if I could have grappled with anything and everything. Then there was hardly one of all my schemes that did not afford me the means of serving some poor devil of a brother author. There were always huge piles of materials to be arranged, sifted, and indexed; volumes of extracts to be transcribed; journeys to be made hither and thither for ascertaining little facts and dates; in short, I could commonly keep half a dozen of the ragged regiment of Parnassus in tolerable ease." I said he must have felt something like what a locomotive engine on a railway might be supposed to do when a score of coal-waggons are seen linking themselves to it the moment it gets the steam up, and it pushes on its course, regardless of the burthen. "Yes," he said, laughing, and making a crashing cut with his axe (for we were felling larch trees), "but there was a cursed lot of dung-carts, too."'

It was amid the busy throng of all this occupation that his rupture with Constable took place, creating the desire, to which we have just alluded, of fighting the Bibliopole with his own weapons. Our readers will judge for themselves of the spirit in which Scott addressed himself to this new enterprise when

* An interesting account of the foundation of the Review is given in Sir John Barrow's 'Autobiography,' p. 492, *seqq.*

they

they have read a letter to Mr. Morritt, of Rokeby Park, which we subjoin :—

'My dear Sir, 'Edinburgh, 14th Jan., 1809.

'For a long while I thought my summons to London would have been immediate, so that I should have had the pleasure to wait upon you at Rokeby Park on my way to town. . . . . Meanwhile, I have been concocting, at the instigation of various loyal and well-disposed persons, a grand scheme of opposition to the proud critics of Edinburgh. It is now matured in all its branches, and consists of the following: a new Review in London, to be called the "Quarterly," William Gifford to be the editor; George Ellis, Rose, Mr. Canning if possible, Frere, and all the ancient anti-Jacobins, to be concerned. The first number is now in hand, and the allies I hope and trust securely united to each other. I have promised to get them such assistance as I can, and most happy should I be to prevail upon you to put your hand to the ark. You can so easily run off an article, either of learning or of fun, that it would be inexcusable not to afford us your assistance.

'Then, to turn the flank of Messrs. Constable and Co., and to avenge myself of certain impertinences which, in the bitterness of their Whiggery, they have dared to indulge in towards me, I have proposed to start against them, on Whitsunday first, the celebrated printer Ballantyne (who had the honour of meeting you at Ashestiel) in the shape of an Edinburgh publisher, with a long purse, and a sound political creed, not to mention an alliance offensive and defensive with young John Murray of Fleet Street, the most enlightened and active of the London trade. By this means I hope to counterbalance the predominating influence of Constable and Co., who at present have it in their power and inclination to forward or suppress any book, as they approve or dislike its political tendency. Lastly, I have caused the said Ballantyne to venture upon an Edinburgh Annual Register, of which I send you a prospectus. I intend to help him myself as far as time will admit, and hope to procure him many respectable coadjutors.'

We know not in what terms to speak of this transaction. It would have been unwise, had it been exactly as Scott describes it. It was perhaps open to even graver objections, looking at it as the facts of the case subsequently came to light. Scott was himself a partner in the publishing, as he had previously been in the printing business, and the only purse on which both depended for existence was his own. The concern never throve. Year after year the necessity for accommodation-bills became more urgent, and Scott either could not, or did not, understand that such a course as this could end only in bankruptcy.

The year 1818 may be said to have found and left Scott at the very height of his prosperity and renown. He had realised the

the day-dream of his boyhood—he was become not a landowner only, but a sort of medieval chieftain. In 1811 he had purchased a farm, which was now grown into a considerable estate. Clarty Hole had become Abbotsford; and, where a modest cottage once stood, a stately mansion was rising. Woods, well kept and arranged, were beginning to feather the hills, which, when they passed into his hands, were bleak and bare; and gardens and terraces, gracefully laid out, looked down upon the Tweed. There he spent the summer and autumn of each year in the enjoyment of everything which was calculated to gratify his tastes and exercise his benevolence. His poetry, if it had in some degree declined in public favour, was still universally read; and his novels —the 'Waverley Novels' as they were called—were in everybody's hands. How they began, and how they forced their way into an amount of popularity quite without precedent, it would be foreign to the purpose of this sketch if we paused to give an account. We content ourselves therefore for the present, by stating that his works were the daily food, not only of his countrymen, but of all educated Europe. His society was courted by whatever England could show of eminence. Station, power, wealth, beauty, and genius strove with each other in every demonstration of respect and worship; and, a few political fanatics and curious poetasters excepted, wherever he appeared, in town or country, whoever had Scotch blood in him, 'gentle or simple,' felt it move more rapidly through his veins when he was in Scott's presence. The Clerkship of Session, of which for five years he had discharged the duties gratuitously, was now worth 1300*l.* a year to him; his Sheriffdom brought in 300*l.* more; and the annual profits of his novels alone had not, for some time, been less than 10,000*l.* a year. In 1815 he had made the acquaintance of the Duke of Wellington in Paris, after visiting the scene of that great man's greatest victory, while as yet the wrecks of war covered the field. Nor were external honours wanting. Towards the end of November, 1818, it was intimated to him that the Chief of the State desired to confer upon him the dignity of a Baronet, which purpose was carried into effect two years later. No doubt Scott had his trials too. All that were in need applied to him for assistance. All who fancied that their merits were overlooked called on him to find an opening for them; and one poetess in particular, Miss Seward, made him the guardian of her posthumous fame—a task which, had it been possible, he would have gladly evaded. But such troubles hardly broke the apparent quiet of his existence. To the outer world, it seemed to be, and to a great extent it was, a singularly joyous one. We have seen how the day went with him at Abbotsford.

Here is a record and life-like description of its progress in Edinburgh :—

'Breakfast was his chief meal. Before that came he had gone through the severest part of his day's work, and he then set to work with the zeal of Crabbe's Squire Tovell:

"And laid at once a pound upon his plate."

No foxhunter ever prepared himself for the field by more substantial appliances. His table was always provided, in addition to the usually plentiful delicacies of a Scotch breakfast, with some solid article, on which he did most hearty execution—a round of beef,—a pasty such as made Gil Blas's eyes water,—or, most welcome of all, a cold sheep's head, the charms of which primitive dainty he has so gallantly defended against the disparaging sneers of Dr. Johnson and his bear-leader. A huge brown loaf flanked his elbow, and it was placed upon a broad wooden trencher, that he might cut and come again with the bolder knife. Often did the clerks' coach, commonly called among themselves *the Lively*, which trundled round every morning to pick up the brotherhood, and then deposited them, at the proper moment, in the Parliament Close—often did this lumbering hackney arrive at his door before he had fully appeased what Homer calls "the sacred rage of hunger;" and vociferous was the merriment of the learned *Uncles* when the surprised poet swung forth to join them, with an extemporised sandwich, that looked like a ploughman's luncheon, in his hand. He never tasted anything more before dinner, and at dinner he ate as sparingly as Squire Tovell's niece from the boarding-school,

"Who cut the sanguine flesh in frustrums fine,
And wondered much to see the creatures dine."

The only dishes he was at all fond of were the old-fashioned ones to which he had been accustomed in the days of Saunders Fairford; and which really are excellent dishes—such, in truth, as Scotland borrowed from France before Catherine de Medicis brought in her Italian virtuosi to revolutionise the kitchen like the court. Of most of these he has, I believe, in the course of his novels found some opportunity to record his esteem. But above all, who can forget that his King Jamie, amidst the splendours of Whitehall, thinks himself an ill-used monarch unless his first course includes *cocky-leekie?*'

Scott had two circles with which he associated, while in Edinburgh: one which, comprising the *élite* of the aristocracy of rank and letters, may be called his refined circle; the other, in which Constable and the Ballantynes play the part of amphitryons, may be spoken of as his jovial circle. We must refer our readers to Mr. Lockhart's admirable volumes for a detailed account of each, a description of which, we can assure them, will more than repay the labour of a perusal. So likewise, to our great regret, we feel ourselves obliged to deal with much that went on at Abbotsford, —the Abbotsford hunt, with the symposium which followed,—the inundation

inundation of strangers from all parts of the world, to whom a hospitable reception was always afforded,—the frequent visits of ladies and gentlemen who knew how to appreciate him as he knew how to appreciate them,—and, still more attractive because appealing with greater force to our convictions and sympathies, the happy intercourse which was kept up among the households of Abbotsford, Chiefswood, Huntley Burn, Gala, and Morton. But the following is really too good not to be extracted at length :—

'Before breakfast was over (Lockhart is describing a day in October, 1818), the post-bag arrived, and its contents were so numerous that Lord Melville asked Scott what election was on hand, not doubting but that there must be some very particular reason for such a shoal of letters. He answered that it was much the same most days, and added, "though no one has kinder friends in the franking line, and though Freeling and Croker especially are always ready to stretch the point of privilege in my favour, I am nevertheless a fair contributor to the revenue, for I think my bill for letters seldom comes under 150*l.* a year, and as to coach parcels, they are a perfect ruination." He then told with high merriment a disaster that had lately befallen him, "One morning last spring I opened a huge lump of a despatch, without looking how it was addressed, never doubting that it had travelled under some omnipotent frank like the First Lord of the Admiralty's, when lo and behold! the contents proved to be a MS. play by a young lady of New York, who kindly requested me to read and correct it, equip it with prologue and epilogue, procure for it a favourable reception from the manager of Drury Lane, and make Murray or Constable bleed handsomely for the copyright; and on inspecting the cover, I found that I had been charged five pounds odd for the postage. This was bad enough, but there was no help, so I groaned and submitted. A fortnight or so after, another packet, of not less formidable bulk, arrived, and I was absent enough to break its seal, too, without examination. Conceive my horror when out jumped the same identical tragedy of the *Cherokee Lovers*, with a second epistle from the authoress, stating that, as the winds had been boisterous, she feared the vessel entrusted with her former communication might have foundered, and therefore judged it prudent to forward a duplicate."

'Scott said he must retire to answer his letters; but that the sociable and the ponies would be at the door by one o'clock, when he purposed to show Melrose and Dryburgh to Lady Melville and any of the rest of the party that chose to accompany them; adding that his son Walter would lead anybody who preferred a gun to the likeliest place for a blackcock, and that Charlie Purdie (Tom's brother) would attend upon Mr. Wilson and whoever else chose to try a cast of the salmon-rod. He withdrew when all this was arranged, and appeared at the time appointed, with, perhaps, a dozen letters sealed for the post, and a coach-parcel addressed to James Ballantyne, which he dropped at the turnpike-gate as we drove to Melrose. Seeing it picked up by a dirty

 urchin,

urchin, and carried into a hedge pot-house, where half-a-dozen nondescript wayfarers were smoking and tippling, I could not but wonder that it had not been the fate of some one of those innumerable packets to fall into unscrupulous hands, and betray the grand secret. That very morning we had seen two post-chaises drawn up at his gate, and the enthusiastic travellers, seemingly decent tradesmen and their families, who must have been packed in a manner worthy of Mr. Gilpin, lounging about to catch a glimpse of him at his going forth. But it was impossible in those days to pass between Melrose and Abbotsford without encountering some odd figure, armed with a sketch-book, evidently bent on a peep at the Great Unknown; and it must be allowed that some of these pedestrians looked as if they might have thought it very excusable to make prize, by hook or by crook, of a MS. chapter of the "Tales of My Landlord."'

When Scott first began to write, he was communicative almost to a fault. All who lived on terms of intimacy with him were informed of his projects and their results. This habit he began to lay aside after the 'Lady of the Lake' made its appearance, and by and by he went into an opposite extreme. The 'Vision of Don Roderick' having partially failed—if we can speak of that as a failure which was a success only not quite so decided as those which preceded it—and some misgivings in regard to 'Rokeby' having risen in his own mind, he put forth, almost simultaneously with this latter work, the 'Bridal of Triermain,' which he passed upon the world as the work of his friend William Erskine. The experiment appears to have satisfied himself; and, when at length he made up his mind to complete the prose tale of 'Waverley,' which had been long begun and laid aside for five years, he put on a disguise, which was never absolutely laid aside till necessity compelled; yet which, almost from the outset, sufficed to mislead only the crowd. Besides that the secret was confided originally to ten, and ultimately to thirty individuals, scarcely a well-instructed outsider failed, after a while, to attribute the authorship of those matchless stories to the right person; so that, when at last the avowal came, it can hardly be said to have surprised even those who listened to it. Alas, alas! the avowal came under circumstances the most distressing; for which already, in spite of the strongest possible appearances to the contrary, the preparations were in progress.

As early as 1810, when the 'Lay' had reached its eleventh, and the 'Lady of the Lake' its fifth edition, the affairs of the publishing and printing establishments, over which the Ballantynes presided, began to show signs of falling into confusion. How Scott, with the facts then brought to his notice, could

could allow himself to remain a partner in these firms, and how, so remaining, he had the temerity to indulge his appetite for land, adding field to field, and farm to farm, must always remain a mystery. So keenly was he affected by the tidings which his partners conveyed to him, that he entertained serious thoughts of looking for employment abroad. He would have certainly accompanied Mr. Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, to India, had that statesman gone out, as he was at one moment expected to do, as Governor-General. Mr. Dundas did not, however, go to India; and Scott, carried away in part by the arguments of the Ballantynes, and in part by his own sanguine temperament, persuaded himself that the vessel would yet stagger through, and assented to an extension, continually increasing, of the system of accommodation bills. So things proceeded; the houses of business always reeling and just able from time to time to stand upon their feet, while he laid out large sums on the expansion and adornment of his estate and castle. Other warnings came, one in 1812 so startling that it induced Scott to make up his difference with Constable, and to put an end to the publishing business, which had so ruinously disappointed him. If he had gone further then, and ceased to connect himself with the printing house, the latter must have doubtless become bankrupt; but he would have been saved. A mistaken sense of honour, we firmly believe, constrained him to turn aside from this prudential course, and every successive year gave him more and more reason to repent it. But whatever was his anxiety, he marvellously concealed it. When his friend and first patron, Charles Duke of Buccleuch, died, he was inconsolable, just as he had been on the demise of the amiable Duchess. While he was launching his two sons into life, the eldest as a cornet of dragoons, the second, first to Oxford, and by-and-by as a clerk in the Foreign Office, the closest observer could not discern the very faintest token of uneasiness about him on his own account. As, also, he rejoiced in the marriage of his eldest daughter with Lockhart, so, by-and-by, the union of his eldest son with a Fifeshire heiress appeared to delight him. At last, however, the crash came. The year 1825 will be for ever memorable in the history of the financial affairs of this country, and to Scott and to the broken reed on which he had too long leaned, it proved fatal. We must decline going into the incidents of that terrible crisis. Enough is done when we state that it did not come without warning. Over and over again Scott remonstrated against some of the measures which his partners proposed, and positively refused to join them in others. Yet with astounding self-delusion he believed that the storm would

would blow over, and that by energy and perseverance that success would yet be attained, to which his sanguine counsellors pointed. The results are well known.

Just as his affairs were clouding over, Scott began to keep a diary. It is upon the whole a sad record. He had spent the summer of 1825 in a tour through Ireland, where the reception awarded to him was enthusiastic, and he intensely enjoyed the grotesque kindness of the most grotesque people on the face of the earth. In August, he returned through Wales and Cumberland to Abbotsford, where he received many visitors, among others Tom Moore, Mrs. Coutts, and the Duke of St. Albans. His outward bearing was what it had ever been, calm, genial, hospitable, kind. Yet the iron was piercing into his soul, and the agony produced by it found fit expression in his journal. For example, on the 14th of December, after his removal to Edinburgh (the diary seems to have been begun only on the 20th of November) we have this entry:—

'Affairs very bad again in the money-market. It must come here, and I have far too many engagements not to feel it. To end the matter at once, I intend to borrow 10,000*l.*, with which my son's marriage contract allows me to charge the estate. This will enable me to dispense in a great measure with bank assistance, and sleep in spite of thunder. I do not know why it is—this business makes me a little bilious, or rather the want of exercise during the Session, and this late change of the weather to too much heat. But the sun and moon shall dance on the green ere carelessness, or hope of gain, or facility of getting cash, shall make me too rash again, were it but for the disquiet of the thing.'

A brave and wise resolve this—but it came too late. Four days subsequently he wrote thus—

'*Dec.* 18. For myself, if things go badly in London, the magic wand of the Unknown will be shivered in his grasp. He must thenceforth be termed the Too-well-known. The feast of fancy will be over with the feeling of independence. He shall no longer have the delight of waking in the morning with bright ideas in his mind, hasten to commit them to paper, and count them, monthly as the means of planting such scaurs, and purchasing such wastes; replacing dreams of fiction by other prospective visions of walks by

"Fountain heads, and pathless groves;
Places which pale passion loves."

'This cannot be; but I may work substantial husbandry, *i. e.*, write history and such concerns. They will not be received with the same enthusiasm; at least I much doubt, the general knowledge that an author must work for his bread, at least for improving his pittance, degrades him and his productions in the public eye. He falls into the second-rate rank of estimation.

"While

"While the harness sore galls, and the spur his side goads,
The high-mettled racer 's a hack on the road."

'It is a bitter thought; but if tears start at it, let them flow. My heart clings to the place I have created. There is scarce a tree in it that does not owe its existence to me.'

What an insight these sentences, written from a full heart, give us into the character of the man. A lofty principle, carried to excess, becomes in his case a snare; and aiming always at the highest place, he forgets that though it may be won, it cannot be permanently retained by measures which will not bear the test of sober judgment. 'Where there is a secret there is always something wrong.' This is true in every instance, and its truth was never more distressingly illustrated than in his. Let us not be misunderstood; Scott was no more capable of lending himself deliberately to a fraud than he was of committing murder. Yet what can be thought of the egregious self-deceit of one, who, priding himself on his reputation as a man of business, and wise in theory, as his letter to his friend Terry shows, could yet for so many years stand upon the very brink of ruin without appearing to know it? James Ballantyne has represented this matter in a death-bed memorandum, from which Lockhart quotes without disputing its fairness:—

'I must here say that it was one of Sir Walter's weaknesses to shrink too much from looking evil in the face, and that he was apt to carry a great deal too far, "sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." I do not think it was more than three weeks before the catastrophe that he became fully convinced it was impending—if, indeed, his feelings ever reached the length of conviction at all. Thus at the last, his fortitude was very sorely tried.'

We will not dwell at length upon the break-up of this great and good man's fortunes. There was no parrying the blow. It fell, and Sir Walter was ruined. He might, under the circumstances, have done as other traders do, surrendered his property, and gone through the bankruptcy court, in which case, with his popularity still as great as ever, it was more than probable that, after getting rid of his annoyances, he would have realised a second fortune, larger and more secure than the first. But to this his gallant spirit would not stoop. He put his affairs into the hands of private trustees. His creditors generously, though, as the event proved, not for themselves unwisely, accepted the arrangement, and he set himself to the task of writing off every shilling that he owed, or dying in the attempt.* Observe how manfully

* The debts of Ballantyne and Co., at the time of their failure, amounted to 117,000*l.* The creditors were eventually paid in full. Scott had, in his lifetime, reduced the debt to 54,000*l.*, which was discharged by his executors out of the monies

manfully he expresses himself on the occasion. There is as much of nature in this burst of confidence as ever showed itself in his fits of despondency, and it is due to his memory to add, that from the spirit of the resolve here enunciated he never afterwards departed.

'*Jan.* 22, 1826. I feel neither dishonoured nor broken down by the bad—now really bad news I have received. I have walked my last over the domains I have planted—sate the last time in the halls I have built. But death would have taken them from me, if misfortune had spared them. My poor people whom I loved so well! There is just another die to turn up against me in this run of ill-luck, *i.e.*, if I should break my magic wand in the fall from this elephant, and lose my popularity with my fortune. Then Woodstock and Bony may both go to the paper-maker, and I may take to smoking cigars and drinking grog, or turn devotee, and intoxicate the brain another way. In prospect of absolute ruin I wonder if they would let me leave the Court of Session. I would like, methinks, to go abroad

"And lay my bones far from the Tweed."

But I find my eyes moistening, and that will not do. It is odd, when I set myself to work *doggedly*, as Dr. Johnson would say, I am exactly the same man that I ever was—neither low-spirited nor *distrait*. In prosperous times I have sometimes felt my fancy and powers of language flag, but adversity is, to me at least, a tonic and bracer; the fountain is convulsed from its innermost recesses, as if the spirit of affliction had troubled it in his passage. Poor Mr. Pole, the harper, sent to offer me 500*l.* or 600*l.*, probably his all. There is much good in the world after all. But I will involve no friend, either rich or poor. My own right hand shall do it, else I will be *done* in the slang language, and *undone* in common parlance. . . . Well, exertion, exertion, O Invention, rouse thyself! May man be kind! may God be propitious! The worst is, I never quite know when I am right or wrong, and Ballantyne, who does know in some degree, will fear to tell me. Lockhart would be worth gold just now, but he, too, might be too diffident to speak broad out. All my hope is in the continued indulgence of the public.'

The above extract shows that Scott, like other men of energy as well as genius, found his best escape from care in constant employment. Formerly he had made a point of laying pen, ink, and paper aside by one o'clock in the day. Now he worked double tides, rising early, sitting late, and not unfrequently depriving himself of out-doors exercise altogether. He had undertaken to write for Constable a 'Life of Napoleon,' which was to come out in two volumes. The subject grew upon him, it was followed up eagerly and painfully, and covered in the

monies arising from his life insurances and the advances made by Mr. Cadell upon his copyright property and literary remains.

end

and nine volumes. It constituted for two years the main object of his literary care, yet by no means engrossed it. 'Woodstock,' and the 'Chronicles of the Canongate,' series after series, as well as articles for the 'Quarterly Review,' went forward with it, *pari passu;* thus proving that, in his case at least, change of labour could be accepted as relaxation. Nor was this all. He found it necessary in 1826, with a view to render his biography as accurate as possible, to inspect the documents laid up in the Foreign Offices of England and France, and paid, in consequence, visits of some duration, both to London and Paris. On these occasions, as well in going as returning, he was Lockhart's guest, and found himself just as much as ever the observed of all observers. George IV. commanded his presence at Windsor, where, in the fishing temple on Virginia Water, he seems to have spent two pleasant days. Rogers, Moore, Croker, Lord Dudley, Sir Thomas Lawrence, Theodore Hook, and many more such like, met him at his son-in-law's table. He was the guest also of the Duke of Wellington, of Peel, and of Croker, then Secretary to the Admiralty, where the leading statesmen of the day assembled to do him honour. Here is the entry of one such day:—

'*Nov.* 16. Breakfasted with Rogers, with my daughters, and Lockhart. Rogers was exceedingly entertaining in his dry, quiet, sarcastic manner. At eleven to the Duke of Wellington, who gave me a bundle of remarks on Buonaparte's "Russian Campaign," written in his carriage during his late mission to St. Petersburgh. It is furiously scrawled, and the Russian names hard to distinguish, but it shall do me yeoman's service. Thence I passed to the Colonial Office, where I concluded my extracts. Lockhart and I dined at the Admiralty *au grand couvert.* No less than five Cabinet Ministers were present —Canning, Huskisson, Melville, Peel, and Wellington, with subsecretaries by the bushel. The cheer was excellent, but the presence of too many men of distinguished rank and power always freezes the conversation. Each lamp shines brightest when placed by itself: when too close they neutralise each other.'

So wrote the man on whose head Fate might be said to be now pouring out the full vials of her wrath. Besides the entire loss of fortune, he was by this time a widower; for in April of this same year Lady Scott had died, while he was from home. The house in Edinburgh, where he had been wont to dispense a generous hospitality, was sold; and as often as business carried him to the Scotch metropolis he inhabited a lodging. His courage never failed. He fought the battle of the Scottish banking system in his letters of Malachi Malagrowther, and commenced the 'Fair Maid of Perth.' It was at this time that he

he judged it expedient to remove the veil which had long ceased in reality to cover his connection with the Waverley Novels. It had become, in fact, a necessary proceeding: because to a republication of these tales, with prefaces and notes, both he and his friends looked for the surest means of discharging the obligations under which he lay. Yet the avowal of the authorship at a Theatrical Fund dinner, over which he presided, took the general public a good deal by surprise. It was done, however, with excellent grace, and operated as it seemed, as a sort of relief to his own feelings. Alas! the end was drawing on.

After completing the 'Fair Maid of Perth' Scott again visited London in 1828, where the first decided manifestations of the complaint under which he by-and-by succumbed showed themselves. In the February preceding (he went to London in April) we find, indeed, in his journal an entry which shows that the mischief was already begun. He had worked unusually hard, dashing off forty printed pages of his story, when, dining afterwards in company with some old friends, an idea took possession of him that he was living a second life, that 'nothing that passed was said for the first time, that the same topics had been discussed, and the same persons had stated the same opinions on them.' He tried to reason himself into the belief that the hallucination could be accounted for on the ground that old friends were likely to say over again to each other much that they had said before. 'But the sensation was so strong as to resemble what is called a mirage in the desert, or a calenture on board of ship, when lakes are seen in the desert and sylvan landscapes in the sea.' He was much distressed by it, and the more that several glasses of wine which he took only augmented the disorder, and that something of it remained with him on the following day. In London the approach of the enemy was almost more marked. He had met at breakfast Mrs. Arkwright, who charmed the company with singing some of her own sweet music, and especially delighted Sir Walter with the air which she had set to his beautiful song in the 'Pirate:'—

'Farewell, farewell, the voice you hear.'

Lockhart thus describes what followed:—

'He was sitting by me, at some distance from the lady, and whispered, as she closed, "Capital words: whose are they? Byron's, I suppose, but I don't remember them." He was astonished when I told him that they were his own, in the 'Pirate.' He seemed pleased at the moment; but said the next minute, "You have distressed me; if memory goes, all is up with me, for that was always my strong point."'

The

The symptoms did not, however, return; so he laboured on. 'Anne of Geierstein' in due time made its appearance, and he then applied himself in earnest to what he called the 'magnum opus,' *i. e.*, the preparation of a collected edition of the whole of the Waverley Novels, of which we have just spoken. The success of the undertaking was immense. Cadell had proposed to begin with an impression of 7000, but so numerous were the applications that he advanced the edition to 12,000, and the actual sale amounted to 35,000 per month. Scott saw in this a prospect of speedily ridding himself and the printing-house of their embarrassments, and went about his daily task—which was that of a giant—in great glee. The 'Tales of a Grandfather' were in immense favour. The 'History of Scotland,' which he had promised to Longmans for 'Lardner's Cyclopædia,' made progress. The 'Quarterly' received repeated contributions, and preparations were set on foot for bringing out an illustrated edition of his poems. And here it is but just to the memory of one of his great admirers that we should notice the honourable part which the late Mr. Murray took in promoting the latter scheme. Scott had purchased up all his copyrights except the fourth share of 'Marmion,' which belonged to Mr. Murray. He wrote to his son-in-law Mr. Lockhart, proposing to purchase this also, and was answered by Mr. Murray himself. The generous Bibliopole would not sell for money what he valued far above its worth in the market, but in the handsomest manner he presented it to Scott, as 'an act of grateful acknowledgment for benefits already received.' Mr. Murray had been early associated with Constable and Ballantyne in Scott's literary undertakings, and with great regret withdrew from the connexion, because he became convinced (as he tried to convince Scott himself) that the reckless nature of their speculations must end in ruin.

But the energies had been overtaxed; and a nature warm, generous, and affectionate, was sorely tried by many deaths among those most dear to it. Erskine was dead, Gifford was dead; so were Sir George Beaumont, Sir William Forbes, and though last not least, so was Tom Purdie, who had expired suddenly. This latter misfortune affected him quite as much as any calamity of the kind to which he had been subjected.

'I have lost,' he writes to Cadell, on the 4th of Nov., 1829, 'my old and faithful servant, my factotum, and am so shocked that I really wish to be quit of the country, and safe in town. I have this day laid him in his grave.'

The life which Sir Walter thenceforth led was one of sheer labour.

labour. Rarely, and never without a pang of regret, would he relax his mind by entering into society of any kind. The warnings which had startled him, while they were yet recent, appeared to have lost their terrors, and he strained the machine as if it were labour-proof. It was a fatal error. On the 15th of February, 1830, a third seizure took him, at once more marked in its immediate character and in its effects more enduring. He had returned from the Parliament House at two o'clock, and was examining certain papers which an old lady had brought, and which he had promised to revise and correct for the press. The old lady sat beside him, and when he rose to dismiss her a slight convulsion was seen to agitate his face. He staggered into the drawing-room and fell flat on the floor, apparently insensible. A surgeon was sent for, who bled him. He was cupped again in the evening, and gradually recovered the possession of speech and the rest of his faculties. The blow was, however, struck; for, though the outer world heard nothing of the incident, and he was able to go about as usual, submitting to the most rigid diet and otherwise living by rule, he was never the same man again. He covered day by day innumerable pages of manuscript, producing almost simultaneously his 'Letters on Demonology' for Murray's 'Family Library,' and a further series of 'Tales of a Grandfather.' But even in the former of these, the 'Letters on Demonology,' evidence of fading powers is perceptible; and in the stories from French history, which make up the latter, both words and arrangement are cloudy. He persevered, however, and wrote at the same time his Scottish History for 'Lardner's Cyclopædia,' a work certainly not worthy of its high parentage.

It was soon after the publication of these works that an arrangement was completed which for some time previously had been in contemplation. The Government of the day had determined on reducing two out of the five Principal Clerkships of Session, and Sir Walter was noted for a retirement. We confess that on looking back upon that transaction, the treatment which he received appears to us to have been the reverse of liberal. A career such as his ought not to have been subjected to the ordinary test of office life. He had done more by his writings to improve the tastes and raise the moral tone of his countrymen than any individual then living; and being, as all the world knew, in pecuniary straits—burdened with liabilities which he refused to cast from him except by honourably and rigidly paying off the last farthing—it would have been rather a just than a generous act had the Government assigned to him for life the full amount of his salary. This, however, was not done. But an

an exact account being taken of the years and months of his service, he was pensioned off, like an ordinary copying clerk, with 800*l.* a year. No doubt a hint was dropped that some special pension might be procured for him; but from this, with honest pride, he turned away. 'My friends,' he says in his diary, before leaving office, 'were desirous to patch up the deficiency with a pension. I did not see well how they could do this without being charged with obloquy, which they shall not be on my account.' When the above entry was made, England had fallen upon troublous times. The cry for Parliamentary Reform had been raised in high quarters, which Sir Walter, true to the principles of a lifetime, resisted; and a pension specially conferred on him just before the Duke went out of office would have been at once looked upon, and not unnaturally, as a job. For pensions stank in men's nostrils, and Scott was by far too manly to endure that odium himself or voluntarily to throw it upon others. But to a Treasury minute assigning to the author of 'Waverley' the full pay of his clerkship for life not a voice would have been raised in opposition.

The loss of the Clerkship involved a change in his domestic habits, of which the results were, to say the least, of very doubtful benefit. He could not afford, with a diminished income, to keep up two houses; and, having no special business drawing him to Edinburgh, he made up his mind to live entirely at Abbotsford. 'Such a break in old habits,' says Lockhart, 'is always a serious experiment; but in his case it was particularly so, because it involved his losing during the winter months, when men most need society, the intercourse of almost all that remained to him of dear familiar friends. He had, besides, a love for the very stones of Edinburgh, and the thought that he was never again to sleep under a roof of his own, in his native city, cost him many a pang.' Another consideration weighed more perhaps with his family than with himself. Who could tell how soon a repetition of the fit, which had so alarmed them, might occur? and, without medical assistance ready at hand, what was his valuable life worth? It is melancholy to read that an attempt was made to smuggle into the household, under the guise of an amanuensis, some clever young doctor; and that, when the proposal was rejected, Mr. James Clarkson, 'his friendly surgeon,' secretly instructed a confidential servant how to use a lancet. We never looked upon a sadder picture than the following touching sentences portray:—

'Affliction, as it happened, lay heavy at this time on the kind house of Huntley Burn also. The eldest Miss Ferguson was on her deathbed; and thus, when my wife and I were obliged to move southwards at

at the beginning of winter, Sir Walter was left almost entirely depen dent on his daughter Anne, William Laidlaw, and the worthy domesti whom I have named. Mr. Laidlaw attended him occasionally, as an ams nuensis, when his fingers were chilblained, and often dined as well a breakfasted with him; and Miss Scott well knew that in all circum stances she might lean to Laidlaw with the confidence of a niece or daughter. A more difficult and delicate task never devolved upon an man's friend than Mr. Laidlaw had about this time to encounter. H could not watch Scott from hour to hour—above all, he could no write to his dictation without gradually, slowly, most reluctantly takin home to his bosom the conviction that the mighty mind, which he ha worshipped through more than thirty years of intimacy, had lo something, and was daily losing something more, of its energy. Th faculties were there, and each of them was every now and then dis playing itself in its full vigour; but the sagacious judgment, th brilliant fancy, the unrivalled memory, were all subject to occasions eclipse—

> "Along the chords the fingers strayed,
> And an uncertain warbling made."

Ever and anon he paused, and looked round him, like one half-wakin from a dream and mocked with shadows. The sad bewilderment o his gaze showed a momentary consciousness that, like Samson in th lap of the Philistine, "his strength was passing from him, and h was becoming weak like unto other men." Then came the stron effort of aroused will—the cloud dispersed as if before a current o purer air—all was bright and serene as of old—and then it close again, as in yet deeper darkness.'

We must hurry over the remainder of this tale, which grows chapter by chapter, more melancholy. Scott would work Another and a more severe fit of paralysis scarcely kept hin idle a fortnight, and remonstrance and advice were alike un availing. 'Count Robert' was completed, and 'Castle Danger ous' begun. In order to obtain a vivid impression of th scenery of that tale, he undertook with his son-in-law a journe into Lanarkshire. He had suffered grievous wrong at Jed burgh, where, going to vote for the Tory candidate, he wa stoned and even spat upon by the mob. The people, at ever stage of the expedition to which we are now referring, treate him with marked respect; and he was greatly moved by it Having accomplished his object he went on to Milton-Lockhart the seat of Lockhart's elder brother, the Member for Lanarkshire where a very small party of old friends was gathered to meet him One of these, Mr. Elliot Lockhart of Borthwickbrae, had, lik himself, been sorely stricken. Each saw in the other the ravage of disease, and they embraced with great emotion; but botl forgot the directions of their medical attendants, and the result

wer

were startling. Scott had promised over-night to visit his friend on his way home; but, on the morrow, a messenger arrived to say that Borthwickbrae, on reaching his own house, had fallen in another fit and was despaired of. Immediately Sir Walter drew his host aside, and besought him to lend him horses as far as Lanark, for he must return home at once; nor would he listen to any persuasions of delay. 'No, William,' was his answer, 'this is a sad warning; I must hence to work while it is called to-day, for the night cometh when no man can work. I put that text many a year ago on my dial-stone; but it often preached in vain.'

The return to Abbotsford was far more rapid than the outward journey; and 'Castle Dangerous' was resumed, continued, and finished. But the brain could stand no more. He was accordingly persuaded to seek some rest, and to seek it in Italy, where his son Charles was then an attaché at Florence. Let it not be forgotten that Sir James Graham, the First Lord of the Admiralty, at once, on the suggestion of Captain Basil Hall, undertook to place a frigate at his disposal. This was an act of grace on the part of a Minister whom Sir Walter certainly did not support, and as such it was fully appreciated. 'Things,' he exclaimed, when the communication was made to him, 'are still in the hands of gentlemen; but woe is me. They have so undermined the state of society, that it will hardly keep together when they cease to be at the head of it.'

He had no wish to leave Abbotsford till the summer was over; and his removal was not pressed. On the contrary, having completed, for the present, all his tasks, he seemed in comparative idleness, and surrounded by those who loved him dearly, to take out, as it were, a new lease of enjoyment.

At last the summer wore itself out, and on the 23rd of September Sir Walter departed, attended by his daughter Anne and Lockhart his son-in-law, for London. Mrs. Lockhart had set out on the 20th to make ready for them, and, on the 28th, after a day spent at Rokeby, they reached Sussex Place, Regent's Park. Scott was no longer able to frequent the society which had always welcomed him with open arms. The time, indeed, would have been unfavourable for dissipation had he been either able or willing to encounter it, for the Reform struggle was at its height. A quiet dinner or two, with small assemblies in the evening, were all that his strength would now bear. These he enjoyed. But he had left his beloved Tweed-side in search of health, and to that object all others were to be made subservient. The Government showed infinite zeal in making all the necessary arrangements for his

his voyage, and on the 23rd of October he set out, attended by his eldest son, for Portsmouth. Here the *Barham*, one of the finest frigates in the service, lay to receive him; and in charge of a skilful and pleasant officer, Captain Pigot, he sailed from England. Malta was the first point reached, though they went out of the way that he might see *in transitu* a submarine volcano, which during the brief period of its existence was known as Graham's Island. Indeed, wherever he desired to go, thither Captain Pigot was prepared to carry him. But we need not stop to describe either the voyage or the manner of his existence in Malta and Naples. All men vied one with another to do him honour. But, alas! the vast intellect clouded rapidly over. A consultation of physicians in London had ascertained, before he departed, that softening of the brain was begun; and day by day, and almost hour by hour, disease made progress. It was of the utmost importance that he should give his mind absolute rest, but he would work. He projected, and actually began, a romance in Malta on the siege of that island, and nearly finished it; as well as another shorter tale, entitled 'Bizarro,' after he had been but a short time at Naples. It was to no purpose that Sir William Gell, seeking to divert his attention, led him to visit all the more remarkable places in the kingdom. He looked upon them with interest only so far as they seemed to awaken in his mind recollections of similar scenes in Scotland.

We never read a sadder story than the narrative of his last visit to the Continent. Lockhart has told it admirably; making wise use of the materials with which such men as Sir William Gell and Mr. Cheney supplied him. The scraps from Scott's remarks on men and things, which these gentlemen have preserved, are most touching, both for their acuteness, and for the deep pathos which pervades them. Take the following. Mr. Cheney is speaking of Scott at Rome, just after the death of Goethe had been communicated to him:—

'He spoke of Goethe with regret; he had been in correspondence with him before his death, and had purposed visiting him at Weimar on returning to England. I told him I had been to see Goethe the year before, and that I found him well, and, though very old, in the perfect possession of all his faculties. "Of all his faculties!" he replied; "it is much better to die than to survive them, and better still to die than to live in the apprehension of it; but the worst of all," he added thoughtfully, "would have been to have survived their partial loss and yet to be conscious of his state." He did not seem, however, to be a great admirer of some of Goethe's works. "Much of his popularity," he observed, "was owing to pieces which in his latter moments

moments he might have wished recalled." He spoke with much feeling. I answered that *he* must derive great consolation in the reflection that his own popularity was owing to no such cause. He remained silent for a moment, with his eyes fixed on the ground: when he raised them, as he shook me by the hand, I perceived that his light-blue eye sparkled with unusual moisture. He added, "I am drawing near to the close of my career: I am fast shuffling off the stage. I have been, perhaps, the most voluminous author of the day; and it is a comfort to me to think that I have tried to unsettle no man's faith, to corrupt no man's principles, and that I have written nothing which on my death-bed I should wish blotted."'

Sir Walter had become very impatient to return home. All the charms of Italy were a burthen to him, and on the 16th of April that journey began which ended at Abbotsford. Whatever was possible to gratify his wishes, and soothe his irritability, was done by his son Charles and the faithful servant Nicolson, who attended him. They passed by Venice, through the Tyrol, Munich, Ulm, and Heidelberg, to Frankfort; but nothing in these several places, not even 'the fondly anticipated chapel at Innsbruck,' arrested his attention. At Mayence he went on board a Rhine steam-boat, and seemed to enjoy the scenery of that unrivalled river; but as soon as his carriage was resumed at Cologne he relapsed into indifference. At Nimeguen another apoplectic seizure occurred, which lasted some minutes; but being bled by Nicolson he recovered his consciousness, and finally, at Rotterdam, took ship for London. He arrived at the St. James's hotel, Jermyn Street, in possession, by fits and starts, of his faculties, and that was all. Sir Henry Halford, Dr. Holland, and one whom he dearly loved, Dr. Ferguson, were in constant attendance upon him; and the several members of his family never left him, except for repose. Nor was the feeling of sympathy confined within the domestic circle. High and low, rich and poor, from the royal family to the hackney-coachman plying in the streets, all classes of persons were earnest in their inquiries about him. The following sentences we copy from the MS. diary of Dr. Ferguson, whose sad loss to society and to themselves his many friends have not yet ceased to deplore:—

'*July* 29, 1834.—Sir Walter lay on the second-floor back room of the St. James's Hotel, in Jermyn Street. He was attended by his faithful servant Nicolson, who lifted him out [of bed] with the ease of a child. I never saw anything more magnificent than his chest and neck. The head, as he lay on the pillow, with the collar of his shirt thrown back, seemed but slightly to swell above the throat. He was calm,

calm, but never collected, during the time he was in Jermyn Street. Still, he either imagined himself in the steamboat, or the noise of the carriages in the street brought up the last election at Jedburgh, where he had been pelted.

'Strange thing it is for palsy to arrest the whole current of thought in the mind at the moment at which it occurs. I once knew a musician who, while putting on his stockings, fell down in an apoplectic fit. He survived one month, and during this time said nothing but "damn the stockings," and in that faith died.

'His constant yearning to return to Abbotsford at last caused Sir Henry Halford, Dr. Holland, and myself to consent to his removal. It was on a calm, clear evening of the 7th of July, 1832, that every preparation was made. He sat in his arm-chair facing the window, which permitted the last rays of the setting sun to fall on his white, uncovered head. Round his body a large loose wrapper had been thrown. His eye was so bright and calm that Lockhart and myself both remarked its vigorous lustre—only it betokened little or no interest in the events before him, but appeared lighted by inward thoughts. He suffered himself to be lifted into his carriage, which was in the street. A crowd had gathered round it, and I observed that more than one gentleman walked his horse up and down to gaze on the wreck of the author of "Waverley." His children were all deeply affected. Mrs. Lockhart trembled from head to foot, and wept bitterly. Charles Scott, Lockhart, and Major Scott were sad. The first looked wretched; the second was pale, absorbed, and impatient; the last was the least affected. Thus surrounded by those nearest to him, he appeared, while yet alive, to be carried to his tomb; for such was the effect on my mind of the long procession of mourning friends.'

Thirty-five years have run their course since the events here recorded befel; thirty-three since the record was made. Of all the individuals connected with it, including the recorder himself, only one now walks this earth; and the few outside that circle, who in more happy days were privileged from time to time to come within it, feel while they look round as some solitary mariner may be supposed to do, who has escaped indeed from the wreck on which his ship-mates have perished, but only to watch the tide, which on its rise must sweep him from the rock to which he clings.

Sir Walter continued in this state during his voyage to Leith, and throughout the brief interval of his rest in Edinburgh.

'They placed him in his carriage, and he lay in the same torpid state during the first two stages on the road to Tweedside. But as we descended the Vale of Gala, he began to gaze about him, and by degrees it was obvious that he was recognising the features of that familiar landscape. Presently he murmured a name or two—"Gala Water! surely—Buckholm! Torwoodlee!" As we rounded the hill at

at Ladhope, and the outline of the Eildons burst on him, he became greatly excited; and when turning himself on the couch his eye caught at length his own towers, at the distance of a mile, he sprang up with a cry of delight.'

It required all the strength of Lockhart and his servant to keep him from leaping out of the carriage.

The return to Abbotsford acted upon him as a breath of air acts upon a fire which is dying out for lack of fuel. He recognised and hailed William Laidlaw, who stood at the hall-door to receive him. He alternately sobbed and smiled over his dogs, as they fawned on him and licked his hands. He slept soundly that night, and awoke on the morrow perfectly conscious and collected. They procured a Bath-chair from Huntley Burn, and he was wheeled up and down for some time on the turf, and among the rose-beds of his garden, then in full bloom. At his own desire they next wheeled him through his rooms, and he kept saying as he moved, 'I have seen much, but nothing like my ain house; give me one turn more.'

The delusion had come over him when in Malta, that all his debts were paid off, and that the future would be to him a season of more perfect enjoyment than the past. A different persuasion took possession of him soon after he found himself at home again; and casting aside the plaids with which they had covered him in his chair, he said, a day or two after his arrival, 'This is sad idleness, I shall forget what I have been thinking of if I don't set it down now. Take me into my room and fetch me the keys of my desk.'

'He solicited this so earnestly,' says Lockhart, 'that we could not refuse; his daughter went into his study, opened his writing-desk, and laid paper and pens in the usual order, and I then moved him through the hall and into the spot where he had always been accustomed to work. When the chair was placed at the desk and he found himself in his old position, he smiled and thanked us and said, "Now give me my pen and leave me a little to myself." Sophia put the pen into his hand, and he endeavoured to close his fingers upon it, but they refused their office and it dropped on the paper. He sank back among his pillows, silent tears rolling down his cheeks; but composing himself by and by, he motioned to me to wheel him out of doors again. Laidlaw met us at the porch, and took his turn of the chair. Sir Walter, after a little while, again dropped into slumber. When he was awaking, Laidlaw said to me, "Sir Walter has had a little repose." "No, Willie," said he, "no repose for Sir Walter but the grave." The tears again rushed from his eyes, "Friends," said he, "don't let me expose myself—get me to bed."'

They got him to bed, and he never rose from it more.

 'About

'About half-past one P.M., on the 21st of September, 1832, Walter breathed his last, in the presence of all his children. It a beautiful day, so warm that every window was wide open, an perfectly still, that the sound of all others most delicious to his the gentle ripple of the Tweed over its pebbles, was distinctly and as they knelt round the bed, and his eldest son kissed and cl his eyes.'

So lived and died one of the greatest writers, one of noblest men, whom Britain—may we not say Europe?—produced. Sir Walter Scott had his failings, and we have scrupled to lay them bare. Few indeed that have ever li could better endure to have their failings exposed. But merits, as well moral as intellectual, were of so transcende nature that they cast quite into the shade errors, which had tl root neither in vice nor in meanness, but in an imaginat preternaturally gigantic. Sir Walter Scott was as much earnest when he set all Scotland agog to greet the arrival George IV., as if he had taken a leading part to bring back Stuarts to the capital of their forefathers. The glass from wh the King drained his whisky to the poet's health, on the quart deck of the Royal yacht, would have been laid up among most sacred relics at Abbotsford, had it not been crushed pieces by an accident. In like manner his own manner of l on Tweed-side, his Abbotsford hunts, his joyous carouses, tra ported him back to times when moss-trooping was a ma occupation. There is not one of his tales, whether in prose verse, which fails to show upon the face of it that the sce which are therein described were as much realities to him as he had lived through them. It was this chronic state of hal cination, indeed, this inability to free himself from the spells enchantment, which not only gave all the colouring to his b romances, but made the man himself what he was. He could more help buying up land, building a castle, dressing its wa with trophies of war and of the chase, and emblazoning its r with the quarterings of noble families, than he could help breathi Yet how generous he was, how gentle, how considerate in all l dealings with all who approached him; how unselfish, how t to his friendships, how willing to forget and to forgive wron by whomsoever committed! Only once, in his whole life, is known to have acted with rudeness to any one, and that w when he turned his back upon the late Lord Holland, becau Lord Holland had spoken ungenerously, as he conceived, o favourite brother in the House of Lords. Of Scott's gre personal courage there could be no doubt. He had some opp tuniti

tunities of proving this in his scuffles with democrats and rioters in early life; and later, when General Gourgaud blustered about what had been written of that gentleman's proceedings at St. Helena, he anticipated a challenge and was ready to accept it. His sense of knightly honour was, indeed, keen to a degree.

Qualities like these, by whomsoever possessed, are always popular; and when, as in the case of Scott, they are combined with the genius which stirs the hearts of nations, they give to their possessor a place in the people's love which no other eminence can command. Proofs of the veneration in which all classes held him greeted Scott wherever he went. Twice, on the occasion of the coronation of George IV., this was shown in a remarkable way. The Rev. Mr. Harness, the accomplished friend of Mrs. Siddons and Lord Byron, describes that while he was standing in Westminster Hall, a spectator of the coronation feast, he observed Sir Walter trying, but in vain, to make his way through the crowd to a seat which had been reserved for him. 'There's Sir Walter Scott,' said Mr. Harness aloud, 'let us make way for him.' There was no need for more. The throng pressed itself back so as to make a lane for Scott, and he passed through without the slightest inconvenience. The same night, walking home with a friend, they fell upon a part of the street which was guarded by the Greys, and by which orders were given that no one should be allowed to pass. 'Take my arm, Sir Walter,' said his friend, 'and we will go elsewhere.' 'What Sir Walter?' demanded the sergeant in command of the party. 'Sir Walter Scott' was the reply. 'What! Sir Walter Scott?' exclaimed the sergeant. 'He shall get through any how. Make room, men, for Sir Walter Scott, our illustrious countryman!' And way was made. Similar to this was the incident which befel when George IV. was in Edinburgh. Sir Walter was proceeding with Sir Robert, then Mr. Peel, up the High-street, to show him the Castle. The throng was great, and Mr. Peel observed, 'Are you not afraid that these good people will mob us, out of admiration for you?' 'Oh, no,' was the reply; 'they are too full of loyalty at this moment to care for anything else.' It was not so; the mob soon recognised their favourite, and they did not hustle or incommode him, but they greeted him with cheers as if he had been the King.

As to the dwellers on the Border—his 'own people,' as he called them—to them he came as near to the condition of a leading chieftain in their clan as it was possible for any man in the nineteenth century to do. The sheriff's will was law to his humble neighbours—

neighbours—the sheriff's society the greatest enjoyment of their lives. 'Eh! Meg,' said a Border farmer to his wife, as he undressed to go to bed, after an Abbotsford hunt-dinner, 'I wish I could sleep a towmont. There's naething worth living for, binna the Abbotsford hunt and the dinner.'

Scott's personal appearance was striking and peculiar. In height he surpassed the middle size. His shoulders were broad, his chest wide, his arms strong, his hands large. But for the shrunken limb he would have been the very *beau ideal* of a stalwart Liddesdale yeoman. His features were not regular: his eyes grey, and deeply set in their sockets; his forehead broad and high, but not particularly so. When in repose his countenance was heavy; but no sooner was his fancy appealed to than it lighted up, and eye and mouth became alike expressive of emotion—either ludicrous or pathetic. His voice was pleasing, though he knew nothing of music; he read well, but with a strong Scottish accent. His conversation overflowed with humour; and in discussing the merits of other men, he seemed always to look for something to praise. No man ever lived who won so many friends and made so few enemies. Absence of all literary envy and jealousy was one of the most striking features of his character. Lord Byron might well say Scott could be jealous of no one.

It was decided that Sir Walter's funeral should be conducted in a very unostentatious manner, only the oldest of his friends being invited to be present. The coffin was borne to the hearse and from the hearse to the grave by his old domestics and foresters, who petitioned that no mercenary hand should be allowed to touch it. Yet of voluntary followers, as soon as the procession set forward, the throng was so great that the carriages alone extended over more than a mile. All the inhabitants of all the villages through which the *cortège* passed turned out in black, and with heads uncovered. The wide enclosure of the Abbey grounds was filled in like manner; and amid profound and reverential silence Archdeacon Williams read the service. Sir Walter sleeps beside his wife in the sepulchre of his fathers; and at his feet lies all that was mortal of his son-in-law and biographer, John Gibson Lockhart.

ART. II.—*Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands, from* 1848 *to* 1861. Edited by Arthur Helps. London, 1868.

THIS work must be considered as the supplement of that volume of royal authorship which in our last number we brought before our readers. It is a record of that daily life to which the former book so touchingly alluded; and whatever of direct biography future volumes may yet give us, and however skilfully Mr. Theodore Martin may execute his task, nothing from another hand can have the interest which this possesses, nor can any retrospect be animated with the living power which belongs to notes such as these of the days which are passed—jotted down at the time with no thought of publication, but only as the outpouring of a happy heart, fixing in an enduring record the thoughts, feelings, and impressions with which, in a sunshine life spent in high moral and intellectual companionship, it was being daily ennobled. The volume consists of journals written by the Queen during excursions in England, Scotland, and Ireland. They have the charm which perfect naturalness combined with exquisite gracefulness might give to another writer; but from their actual writer they have a far higher interest. They serve, as nothing which was written for the purpose of doing it could serve, to set before her people the real tone of the life which their Queen has been for so many years continually leading; its simplicity, its truthfulness, its high family affectionateness, its thorough sympathy with all around the royal persons who form the centre of the group, and who, even in hours of unusual rest from public business, are still engaged in discharging family duties with a care and kindness which few households could equal, and perhaps none surpass.

But though this insight into the Royal Family is the main interest of this volume, to which we must return, and of which we must give some exhibition in the way of extracts from these pages, there is about such a volume as this another interest beside this which is so directly personal.

The elements of future history are stored in such a narrative. What would we not give to have such a diary of Henry VII., when, after having won his throne, he was endeavouring to conciliate the subjects amongst whom he made his carefully-planned progresses; or such journals from the pen of Elizabeth, the sovereign who, of all who have sat upon our ancient throne, was the most given to excursions through all her dominions. The short fragmentary notices which we do possess of such royal

royal tours of old, only make us feel the more acutely how precious such relics would be. We have one such record of the first progress made by Henry VII., when the storms through which his succession to the Crown was effected had been sufficiently calmed to allow of his coronation, and he set out in 1486 to show himself as King throughout his wide dominion. We shall preserve the irregular and capricious spelling of the old Cotton MSS., and give it exactly as it may yet be read in the British Museum, from what terms itself 'A short and brief Memory by license and correcyon of the first Progress of our Soveraigne Lorde King Henry the VII. After his noble Coronation, Cristemas, and Parlement, holden at his Paleys at Westm̃r. towards the north parties:'—

'In the. . . daye of Marche he rode his Hors well and nobly accompanyed, at Segnt Johns of London, and rode to Waltham, and from thens the highway to Cambrige where his Grace was honourably receyvede both of the Universite and of the Towne. And from thence he rode by Huntingdon, Stamforde, and to Lincolne, and then his Grace kepte right devoutly the Holy Fest of Ester: and full like a Cristen Prynce harde his dyvine servyce in the Cathedral Churche and in no pryve Chapell: and on Shere * thursday he had in the Bysshoppes Halle xxix pore men to whom he humbly and cristenly for Crysten love with his noble handes did washe ther fete, and gave as grete almes like as other hys noble Progenitors Kynges of England have been accustomed aforetyme: and also on Good Friday after all his offering and observances of halowing of Rynges † after dyner gave marvelous grete sumes of money in grotes to poore people, besides grete alms to poor Frears, Prysoners, and Layars house of that countrey: and on Sheer Thursday, Good Fryday, Ester Even and Ester day the Bysshop of that See dyd the Dyvyne Servyce, and the Kynge hemself kept every day thus . . . and that same weke he removed unto Nottingham.' ‡

How charming would it be to have Henry's own record of this 'riding forth on his Hors,' well and nobly accompanied; to know what he really felt towards the University of Cambridge; how its high authorities received him; what he ate and drank; and how he fared in the High Halls at Stamford and in the grand old Palace, which at Lincoln looked out over the wide-spread champaign of Lincolnshire.

But of all our sovereigns perhaps Elizabeth, as we have said, took the greatest pleasure in royal progresses, and certainly none

* *Shere* or *Sheer* Thursday, so called from the preparation made by shaving and cutting the hair for Easter.

† For medical use against epilepsy, &c.

‡ Ex lib. Cotton, Julius XII., fol. 504.

could

could have yielded incidents which it would be more delightful to follow closely from the hand of the royal pen than those which must have befallen her. We do not believe in the deep State motives which have been suggested for these frequent pilgrimages, as having been undertaken in order to reduce the power of some whom she suspected, by the expense which they inflicted on her hosts. She seems to have wished to see things with her own eyes; moreover, she evidently enjoyed not a little the incense so freely burned before her in the great provincial houses where she halted. There was, too, apparently about her a certain restlessness of temper, which was perhaps bred partly from the unsettledness of her early years and partly from the strange and unhappy circumstances of her unmarried condition after she became Queen. From her accession, accordingly, almost to the end of her days, she was a great traveller through England, visiting in succession most parts of Surrey, Hampshire, Berkshire, Kent, Sussex, Hertfordshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Essex, Suffolk, Wiltshire. These migrations were continued till 1602, within a few weeks of her death.

In the days of her early troubles, Elizabeth had known other progresses than these to which after her coming to the throne she was so much devoted. After Sir Thomas Wyatt's rebellion (1554), which she lay under some suspicion of favouring, when, at the end of May, she was delivered from close imprisonment in the Tower, she was sent under the command of Sir Henry Bedingfield and Lord Williams of Thame,* to the royal manor of Woodstock. The first night of her journey she lay at Richmond, where—being watched all night by the soldiers, and all access of her own private attendants utterly prohibited—she began to be convinced that orders had been given to put her privately to death. The next day she reached Windsor, where she was lodged in the Dean's house. She then passed to Lord Williams' seat at Ricot, in Oxfordshire, where, to Bedingfield's great disgust, she 'was verie princelie entertained.' Arriving at Woodstock she was kept in the Gate House of the Palace, and her expectations and feelings may be gathered from three lines which Holinshed records her to have written with a diamond on her chamber window:—

> 'Much suspected, by† me
> Nothing proved can be,
> Quoth Elizabeth prisoner.'

Having after many months obtained her release, she set out

* Nichols' 'Progresses of Elizabeth,' i. 7.
† *By*, in the old sense of *against*.

on her first day's journey from Woodstock to Ricot in such tempestuous weather that 'her hood and the attire of her head were twice or thrice blown off'—disarrangements of her dress which she was compelled to remedy under a hedge near the road, as Bedingfield would not suffer her to make use of a neighbouring gentleman's house for the purpose. Perhaps the remembrance of these early trials made her love to haunt the same places when at the noonday of her power she could visit them in the pride of her sovereignty; for Woodstock and 'Rycort' are amongst the most frequent of her progresses, and are the scenes of some of her grandest receptions. Thus, in 1592, having been 'entertained magnifically' by the Lady Russell at Bissam, and the Lord Chandos at Sudly, where she was welcomed as the 'Queene of this island, the wonder of the world and Nature's glory,' she passed on to Ricorte, where on Sunday, being received in the garden with 'sweete musicke of sundry sorts, she is presented with gifts which purport to come from all quarters: an "Irish lacque," bringing her a Darte of gold set with diamonds, with this motto in Irish, I fly onely for my sovereign; a shipper from Flanders delivered a key of golde set with diamonds, with this motto in Dutch, I onlie open to you; a French page brings a sword of golde set with diamonds and rubyies, with this motto in French, Drawen only in your defence; and a truncheon set with diamonds, with the motto in Spanish, I do not commande but under you.' *

In these progresses she sometimes threw off her state, as when after visiting Kenilworth Castle in 1572, she returned very late at night to Warwick, and 'because she woold see what chere my Lady of Warwick made, she sodenly went into Mr. Thomas Fisher's house, and there fynding them at supper, satt downe awhile, and after a little repast rose agayne, leaving the rest at supper, and went to visite the good man of the house, Thomas Fisher, who at that tyme was grevously vexed with the gowt.' †

Very different then was an excursion, even through these home counties, from anything we know: we may form some idea of the change by comparing our own experience of a journey from London to Edinburgh with that accomplished at the death of Elizabeth by a 'hasty Hudson' of that day. Instead of being whirled along by the easy speed of an express train, when Sir Robert Carey reached Edinburgh to bring to James I. the news of his succession to the throne he was 'admitted to the King bebloodied with great falles and bruises' as the consequences

* 'Progresses, &c.,' 1592. Quoted by Nichols, vol. ii. p. 592.

† From a MS. called the 'Black Book,' belonging to the Corporation of Warwick, fol. 65—70. Quoted by Nichols.

and

and witnesses of his speed.'* The Queen's temporary absence from the capital, even in one of the midland counties, in those days difficult of travel, led to such provisions being made as would not a little astonish the magnates of the city of London if they were thought needful upon the starting of the royal train for distant Balmoral. Thus when she set forth on her progress of 1572 she wrote first to the Lord Mayor that she had appointed for his assistance 'during this time of our progress and absence in remote parts from thence, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, and others . . . . that they shall join with you to devise . . . . for quiet order to be continued in our said city.'

Future generations will turn to the 'Leaves from the Journal of our Life,' of Queen Victoria, with the same historical interest with which we gaze into the comparatively unpersonal records of the progresses of Elizabeth. But with this difference: that instead of seeing a brocaded figure receiving the incense of an antique and almost barbarous flattery, or toying with Leicester, or simulating a romantic passion for the Duke of Anjou at the very moment when she is frigidly rejecting his proposals—whilst the whole mystery of her remarkable life, her real relations with Leicester and Essex, with Burleigh and Cecil, are almost hidden from us —our descendants will have the great figures of the historical portrait set before them with a minuteness of description, a completeness of detail, and a delicacy of touch, which will, after any lapse of time, reproduce before them the real life of the present century in its best proportions.

This is in truth the master interest of this volume. Mr. Arthur Helps, who at the Queen's command has edited it, gives a clear and concise account both of the original composition of the volume and of the circumstances which led to its publication:—

'During one of the Editor's official visits to Balmoral, Her Majesty very kindly allowed him to see several extracts from her journal relating to excursions in the Highlands of Scotland, and afterward to progresses in England, Ireland, and the Channel Islands. He was much interested by them; and expressed the interest which he felt. It then occurred to Her Majesty that these extracts, referring, as they did, to some of the happiest hours of her life, might be made into a book, to be printed privately, for presentation to members of the Royal Family and Her Majesty's intimate friends; especially to those who had accompanied and attended her in these tours.

'It was then suggested to Her Majesty by some persons, among them a near and dear relative of the Queen, and afterwards by the

* 'Milligton's True Narration,' given in Nichols' 3rd volume.

Editor,

Editor, that this work, if made known to others, would be very interesting to them as well as to the Royal Family and to Her Majesty's intimate friends. The Queen, however, said that she had no skill whatever in authorship; that these were, for the most part, mere homely accounts of excursions near home; and that she felt extremely reluctant to publish anything written by herself.

'To this the Editor respectfully replied, that, if printed at all, however limited the impression, and however careful the selection of persons to whom copies might be given, some portions of the volume, or quite as probably incorrect representations of its contents, might find their way into the public journals. It would therefore, he thought, be better at once to place the volume within the reach of Her Majesty's subjects, who would, no doubt, derive from it pleasure similar to that which it had afforded to the Editor himself. Moreover, it would be very gratifying to her subjects—who had always shown a sincere and ready sympathy with the personal joys and sorrows of their Sovereign—to be allowed to know how her rare moments of leisure were passed in her Highland home, when every joy was heightened, and every care and sorrow diminished, by the loving companionship of the Prince Consort. With his memory the scenes to which this volume refers would always be associated.

'Upon these considerations Her Majesty eventually consented to its publication.'

The editor proceeds to describe the volume as containing—

'A record of the impressions received by the Royal Author in the course of these journeys, as might hereafter serve to recall to her own mind the scenes and circumstances which had been the source of so much pleasure. All references to political questions, or to the affairs of Government, have, for obvious reasons, been studiously omitted. The book is mainly confined to the natural expressions of a mind rejoicing in the beauties of nature, and throwing itself, with a delight rendered keener by the rarity of its opportunities, into the enjoyment of a life removed, for the moment, from the pressure of public cares.'

The practised hand of Mr. Helps supplies us further with some of the literary characteristics of the volume: he notices—

'The picturesque descriptions of scenery in which the work abounds; the simplicity of diction throughout it: and the perfect faithfulness of narration which is one of its chief characteristics; for in every page the writer describes what she thinks and feels, rather than what she might be expected to think and feel.'—p. xi.

Every one who reads the book, and no book will be more widely read, must feel the truth of these descriptions of its style and composition. The excursions in England and the Channel Islands which are recorded in this volume, were made in the summer

summer and autumn of 1846, and consisted of a yacht visit to Devonshire, Cornwall, and Guernsey and Jersey. One or two extracts will do more than any description to bring the passing scenes of such record before the reader's eye :—

'*On board the Victoria and Albert, Dartmouth, Thursday, August* 20, 1846.—We steamed past the various places on the beautiful coast of Devonshire which we had passed three years ago till we came to Babbicombe, a small bay, where we remained an hour. It is a beautiful spot, which before we had only passed at a distance. Red cliffs and rocks with wooded hills, like Italy, and reminding one of a ballet or play where nymphs are to appear—such rocks and grottos, with the deepest sea, on which there was not a ripple. We intended to disembark and walk up the hill; but it came on to rain very much, and we could not do so. We tried to sketch the part looking towards Torbay. I never saw our good children looking better, or in higher spirits. I contrived to give Vicky* a little lesson by making her read in her English history.'—p. 279-280.

Two days later the Journal, dated Plymouth, Saturday, August 22, says :—

'Albert was up at six o'clock, as he was to go to Dartmoor Forest. At ten I went in the barge with the two children, the ladies, Baron Stockmar, and Lord Alfred Paget, and landed at Mount Edgcumbe . . . . . There were crowds where we landed, and I feel so shy and put out without Albert . . . . . A little after twelve we returned to the yacht, which had been beset with boats ever since six in the morning. Albert returned safely to me at one o'clock, much pleased with his trip, and said that Dartmoor Forest was like Scotland . . . . Poor Lord Mount Edgcumbe is in such a sad, helpless state; but so patient and cheerful.'—p. 284-287.

'*In Guernsey Bay, off St. Pierre, Guernsey, Sunday, August* 23.—On waking, the morning was so lovely that we could not help regretting that we could not delay our trip a little, by one day at least, as the Council which was to have been on the 25th is now on the 29th. Albert thought we might perhaps manage to see one of the Channel Islands, and accordingly it was settled that we should go to Guernsey, which delighted me, as I had so long wished to see it. The day splendid . . . The sea the whole way was as calm as it was in '43 . . . . . As we approached we were struck by the beauty of the Guernsey coast, in which there are several rocky bays, and the town of St. Pierre is very picturesquely built, down to the water's edge . . . . We anchored at seven, immediately opposite St. Pierre, and with the two islands on the other side of us.'—p. 287-288.

'*August* 24.—This island with its bold point, and the little one of Cornet with a sort of castle on it (close to which we were anchored),

* The Princess Royal.

and

and the three islands of Herm, Jethou, and Sark, with innumerable rocks, are really very fine and peculiar, especially as they then were in bright sunlight. We both sketched, and at a quarter to nine got into our barge with our ladies. The pier and shore were lined with crowds of people, and with ladies dressed in white, singing "God save the Queen," and strewing the ground with flowers. We walked to our carriage, preceded by General Napier, brother to Sir Charles (in Scinde), a very singular-looking old man, tall and thin, with an aquiline nose, piercing eyes, and white moustaches and hair. The people were extremely well-behaved and friendly, and received us very warmly as we drove through the narrow streets, which were decorated with flowers and flags, and lined with the Guernsey militia, 2000 strong, with their several bands. Some of the militia were mounted.

'The vegetation beyond the town is exceedingly fine; and the evergreens and flowers most abundant. The streets and hills steep, and the view from the fort, which is very high (and where General Napier presented me with the keys), is extremely beautiful. You look over the bay of Guernsey, and see opposite to you the islands of Herm, Jethou, and Sark; with Alderney, and the coast of France, Cape de la Hague, to the left in the distance, and to the right in the distance, Jersey . . . . They belonged to the Duchy of Normandy, and have been in our possession ever since William the Conqueror's time. King John was the last of their sovereigns who visited them. We drove along the pier, and then embarked amidst great cheering. It was all admirably managed; the people are extremely loyal.'—p. 289-290.

After the interruption of the Council the excursion was resumed, and the Journal thus records its course:—

'*On board the Victoria and Albert, off St. Heliers, Jersey, Wednesday, September* 2, 1846.—At a quarter past seven o'clock we set off with Vicky, Bertie,* Lady Jocelyn, Miss Kerr, Mdlle. Gruner, Lord Spencer, Lord Palmerston, and Sir James Clark, and embarked at Osborne pier. There was a good deal of swell. It was fine, but very cold at first. At twelve we saw Alderney, and between two and three got into the Alderney Race, where there was a great deal of rolling, but not for long. We passed between Alderney and the French coast—Cape de la Hague—and saw the other side of Alderney; and then, later, Sark, Guernsey, and the other islands. After passing the Alderney Race it became quite smooth; and then Bertie put on his sailor's dress, which was beautifully made by the man on board who makes for our sailors. When he appeared, the officers and sailors, who were all assembled on deck to see him, cheered, and seemed delighted with him.

'The coast of Jersey is very beautiful, and we had to go nearly all round in order to get to St. Heliers . . . . . The red cliffs and rocks, with the setting sun gilding and lighting them all up, were beautiful.

* The Prince of Wales.

At

At last, at a quarter to seven, we arrived in this fine large bay of St. Aubin, in which lies St. Heliers; and after dinner we went on deck to see the illumination and the bonfires.'—p. 292-293.

'*Off St. Heliers, Thursday, September* 3.—A splendid day. I never saw a more beautiful deep blue sea, quite like Naples; and Albert said that this fine bay of St. Aubin, in which we lie, really is like Naples. Noirmont Point terminates in a low tower to our left, with St. Aubin and a tower on a rock in front of it; farther in, and to our right, Elizabeth Castle, a picturesque fort on a rock, with the town of St. Heliers behind it.

'The colouring and the effect of light were indescribably beautiful. . . . . We landed at the stairs of the Victoria Harbour, amid the cheers of the numberless crowds, guns firing, and bands playing; were received, as at Guernsey, by all the ladies of the town, very gaily dressed, who, strewing flowers on our way, conducted us to a canopy, where I received the address of the States and of the militia.

'We then got into our carriage and drove along the pier; Colonel Le Couteur, my militia aide-de-camp, riding by my side, with other officers, and by Albert's side Colonel Le Breton, commanding the militia, who, 5000 strong, lined the streets, and were stationed along the pier. The States walking in front. The crowds were immense, but everything in excellent order, and the people most enthusiastic; the decorations and arches of flowers were really beautifully done, and there were numberless kind inscriptions.

'We then proceeded . . . . . through the interior of the island, which is extremely pretty and very green—orchards without end, as at Mayence. We passed the curious old tower of La Hougue Bie, of very ancient date, and went to the castle of Mont Orgeuil, in Grouville Bay, very beautifully situated, completely overhanging the sea, and where Robert, Duke of Normandy, son of William the Conqueror, is said to have lived.'—p. 294-296.

The home voyage was propitious. The evening at Falmouth

'beautiful, and the sea as smooth as glass, and without even a ripple. The calmest night possible, with a beautiful moon, when we went on deck; every now and then the splashing of oars and the hum of voices were heard; but they were the only sounds, unlike the constant dashing of the sea against the vessel, which we heard all the time we were at Jersey.'—p. 297-298.

The next day they anchor off Penzance amidst a 'crowd of boats.'

'*Mount's Bay, Cornwall, Saturday, September* 5.—Numbers of Cornish pilcher fishermen, in their curious large boats, kept going round and round, and then anchored, besides many other boats full of people. They are a very noisy, talkative race, and speak a kind of English hardly to be understood.

'During our voyage I was able to give Vicky her lessons.'—p. 299.

Soon

Soon after the Royal party came on board—

'They [illegible] "the Duke of Cornwall," so I stepped out of the [illegible] and Lord Palmerston told them that [illegible] and the old mayor of Penryn [illegible] a blessing to his parents and [illegible]'—p. [illegible]

There were some [illegible] of Cornish interest in the Duke:—

'[illegible] the whole population poured out on foot and in carts [illegible] and were enchanted when [illegible] it was a very pretty, gratifying sight.

'We went straight on to Swan Pool outside Pendennis Castle, where we got out the barge and rowed near to the shore to see a net drawn.'—p. [illegible]

On the 6th of September the excursion ended at Osborne.

There are journals of two visits to Ireland, the first in 1844 and the second in 1861. The first commences with Cork, which is pronounced to be—

'Not at all like an English town, and looking rather foreign. The crowd is a noisy, excitable, but very good-humoured one, running and pushing about, and laughing, talking, and shrieking. The beauty of the women is very remarkable, and struck us much; such beautiful dark eyes and hair, and such fine teeth; almost every third woman was pretty, and some remarkably so. They wear no bonnets, and generally long blue cloaks; the men are very poorly, often raggedly dressed; and many wear blue coats and short breeches with blue stockings.'—p. 251.

The Royal party, after visiting Dublin, come in for some characteristic rejoicings at Castors, the seat of the Duke of Leinster,

'One of the kindest and best of men. After luncheon we walked out and saw some of the country people dance jigs, which was very amusing. It is quite different from the Scotch reel; not so animated, and the steps different, but very droll. The people were very poorly dressed in thick coats, and the women in shawls. There was one man who was a regular specimen of an Irishman, with his hat on one ear. Others in blue coats, with short breeches and blue stockings. There were three old and tattered pipers playing. The Irish pipe is very different to the Scotch; it is very weak, and they don't blow into it, but merely have small bellows which they move with the arm.'—261-262.

The tour takes them on to Belfast, and thence by a stormy passage to Scotland.

The

The main part of the volume, as the title intimates, consists of journals which record the daily life of the Royal party in their Highland home. This is preceded by notes of three visits which preceded their settlement at Balmoral in 1848. The first visit was in 1842, which took them in succession to Dalkeith, Dalmeny, Dupplin, Scone, Dunkeld, Taymouth, Drummond Castle, and gave them a good introduction to the northern kingdom. During this visit the Prince had his first experience of deer-stalking, which the need of exertion of every sort, both of mind and body, at once recommended strongly to him. He gives his first impression of it in a letter to the late Prince of Leiningen:—

'Without doubt deer-stalking is one of the most fatiguing, but it is also one of the most interesting of pursuits. There is not a tree or a bush behind which you can hide yourself. . . . . One has, therefore, to be constantly on the alert in order to circumvent them, and to keep under the hill out of their wind, crawling on hands and knees, and dressed entirely in grey.'—p. 35.

The Journal marks in the entry of September 14th the affection to her northern dominion already created in the Queen's mind by a first visit to it:—

'This is our last day in Scotland; it is really a delightful country, and I am very sorry to leave it.'—p. 38.

In 1844 a visit follows to Blair Athole, and in 1847 a tour succeeds round the west coast. Throughout these Journals there are many of those natural touches which constitute one especial charm of the whole volume. Here are one or two examples:—

'About three miles beyond Dundee we stopped at the gate of Lord Camperdown's place: here a triumphal arch had been erected, and Lady Camperdown and Lady Duncan and her little boy, with others, were all waiting to welcome us, and were very civil and kind. The little boy, beautifully dressed in the Highland dress, was carried to Vicky, and gave her a basket with fruit and flowers. I said to Albert I could hardly believe that our child was travelling with us—it put me so in mind of myself when I was the "little Princess." Albert observed that it was always said that parents lived their lives over again in their children, which is a very pleasant feeling.

'Nothing could be quieter than our journey, and the scenery is so beautiful! It is very different from England: all the houses built of stone; the people so different—sandy hair, high cheek-bones; children with long shaggy hair and bare legs and feet; little boys in kilts. Near Dunkeld, and also as you get more into the Highlands, there are prettier faces. Those jackets which the girls wear are so pretty; all the men and women, as well as the children, look very healthy. We

saw Birnam Wood and Sir W. Stewart's place in that fine valley on the opposite side of the river. All along such splendid scenery, and Albert enjoyed it so much—rejoicing in the beauties of nature, the sight of mountains, and the pure air.

'We got out at an inn (which was small, but very clean) at Dunkeld. Such a charming view from the window! Vicky stood and bowed to the people out of the window. There never was such a good traveller as she is, sleeping in the carriage at her usual times, not put out, not frightened at noise or crowds, but pleased and amused.'—p. 47, 48.

'*Blair Castle, Blair Athole, Thursday, September* 12.—We took a delightful walk of two hours. We went through the wood, along a steep winding path over-hanging the rapid stream. These Scotch streams, full of stones, and clear as glass, are most beautiful; the peeps between the trees, the depth of the shadows, the mossy stones, mixed with slate, &c., which cover the banks, are lovely; at every turn you have a picture. We were up high, but could not get to the top; Albert in such delight; it is a happiness to see him, he is in such spirits.

'He said that the chief beauty of mountain scenery consisted in its frequent changes.

'As we left the wood we came upon such a lovely view—Ben-y-Ghlo straight before us—and under these high hills the river Tilt gushing and winding over stones and slates, and the hills and mountains skirted at the bottom with beautiful trees; the whole lit up by the sun, and the air so pure and fine; but no description can at all do it justice, or give an idea of what this drive was.

'Oh! what can equal the beauties of nature! What enjoyment there is in them! Albert enjoys it so much; he is in ecstasies here. He has inherited this love for nature from his dear father.'

Here is the first account of one of those half-accompanied deer-stalks which allow of ladies sharing in the wild pleasures of the Highlands:—

'We stopped at the top of the Chrianan, whence you look down an immense height. Here the eagles sometimes sit. Albert looked about in great admiration. We then went nearly to the top of Cairn Chlamain, and here we separated, Albert going off with Peter, Lawley, and two other keepers, to get a "quiet shot," as they call it; and Lady Canning, Lord Glenlyon, and I went up quite to the top, which is deep in moss. Here we sat down and stayed some time sketching the ponies below—Lord Glenlyon and Sandy remaining near us. The view was quite beautiful, nothing but mountains all around us, and the solitude, the complete solitude, very impressive. We descended this highest pinnacle, and proceeded on a level to meet Albert. We met him shortly after; he had had bad luck, I am sorry to say. We then sat down on the grass and had some luncheon; then I walked a little with Albert and we got on our ponies. As we went on towards home some deer were seen in Glen Chroime, which is called the "Sanctum;"

"Sanctum;" where it is supposed that there are a great many. Albert went off soon after this, and we remained on Sron a Chro for an hour, I am sure, as Lord Glenlyon said by so doing we should turn the deer to Albert, whereas if we went on we should disturb and spoil the whole thing. So we submitted. Albert looked like a little speck creeping about on an opposite hill. We saw four herds of deer, two of them close to us. It was a beautiful sight.

'As the sun went down the scenery became more and more beautiful, the sky crimson, golden-red and blue, and the hills looking purple and lilac, most exquisite, till at length it set, and the hues grew softer in the sky and the outlines of the hills sharper. I never saw anything so fine. It soon, however, grew very dark.

'At length Albert met us. He had been very unlucky, and had lost his sport, for the rifle would not go off just when he could have shot some fine harts; yet he was as merry and cheerful as if nothing had happened to disappoint him.

'We saw a flight of ptarmigan, with their white wings, on the top of Sron a Chro; also plovers, grouse, and pheasants.'

This was the last day of the visit to Blair Athole:—

'I rode back on "Arghait Bhean" * for the last time, and took a sad leave of him and of faithful Sandy McAra.'

'Lord Aberdeen was quite touched when I told him I was so attached to the dear, dear Highlands, and missed the fine hills so much. There is a great peculiarity about the Highlands and Highlanders; and they are such a chivalrous, fine, active people. Our stay among them was so delightful. Independently of the beautiful scenery, there was a quiet, a retirement, a wildness, a liberty, and a solitude that had such a charm for us.'—p. 64.

This affection for the

> 'Land of brown heath and shaggy wood,
> Land of the mountain and the flood,'

was not a little increased by the succeeding visit to the West of Scotland, and led before long to the purchase of Balmoral as what it is so desirable that the Queen of Great Britain should possess—a really Highland home. Here is the record of its 'first impressions:'—

'*Balmoral, Friday, September* 8, 1848.—We arrived at Balmoral at a quarter to three. It is a pretty little castle in the old Scottish style. There is a picturesque tower and garden in front, with a high wooded hill: at the back there is wood down to the Dee; and the hills rise all around. At half-past four we walked out, and went up to the top of the wooded hill opposite our windows, where there is a cairn, and

* 'This pony was given to me by the Duke of Athole in 1847, and is now alive at Osborne.'

up which there is a pretty winding path. The view from here, looking down upon the house, is charming. To the left you look towards the beautiful hills surrounding Loch-na-Gar, and to the right, towards Ballater, to the glen (or valley) along which the Dee winds, with beautiful wooded hills, which reminded us very much of the Thüringerwald. It was so calm, and so solitary, it did one good as one gazed around; and the pure mountain air was most refreshing. All seemed to breathe freedom and peace, and to make one forget the world and its sad turmoils.

'The scenery is wild, and yet not desolate. Then the soil is delightfully dry. We walked beside the Dee, a beautiful, rapid stream, which is close behind the house. The view of the hills towards Invercauld is exceedingly fine.'—p. 101-102.

Excursions, drives, deer-stalking, incognito journeys, with some of the incidents which in Eastern garb delighted the great Haroun Alraschid, soon followed. To a few of these we shall treat our readers. Here is the first ascent of Loch-na-Gar:—

'*Saturday, September* 16, 1848.—At half-past nine o'clock Albert and I set off in a postchaise, and drove to the bridge in the wood of Balloch Buie, about five miles from Balmoral, where our ponies and people were. Here we mounted, and were attended by a keeper of Mr. Farquharson's as guide, Macdonald *—who, with his shooting-jacket, and in his kilt, looked a picture—Grant † on a pony, with our luncheon in two baskets, and Batterbury ‡ on another pony. We went through that beautiful wood for about a mile, and then turned and began to ascend gradually, the view getting finer and finer; no road, but not bad ground—moss, heather, and stones. Albert saw some deer when we had been out about three-quarters of an hour, and ran off to stalk them, while I rested; but he arrived just a minute too late. He waited for me on the other side of a stony little burn, which I crossed on my pony, after our faithful Highlanders had moved some stones

* 'A Jäger of the Prince's, who came from Fort Augustus in the west: he was remarkably tall and handsome. The poor man died of consumption at Windsor, in May, 1860. His eldest son was Attaché to the British Legation in Japan. He died in 1866. The third son, Archie, is Jäger to the Prince of Wales, and was for a year with the beloved Prince.'

† 'Head-keeper. He had been nearly twenty years with Sir Robert Gordon, nine as keeper; he was born in Braemar, in the year 1810. He is an excellent man, most trustworthy, of singular shrewdness and discretion, and most devotedly attached to the Prince and myself. He has a fine intelligent countenance. The Prince was very fond of him. He has six sons—the second, Alick, is wardrobeman to our son Leopold: all are good, well-disposed lads, and getting on well in their different occupations. His mother, a fine, hale, old woman of eighty years, 'stops' in a small cottage which the Prince built for her in our village. He, himself, lives in a pretty Lodge called Croft, a mile from Balmoral, which the Prince built for him.'

‡ 'A groom (now dead some years) who followed me in his ordinary dress, with [illegible]n boots and gaiters, and seemed anything but happy. He was replaced by a [illegible]ie.'

and

and made it easier. We then went on a little way, and I got off and walked a bit, and afterwards remounted, Macdonald leading my pony. The view of Ben-na-Bhourd, and indeed of all around, was very beautiful; but as we rose higher we saw mist over Loch-na-Gar. Albert left me to go after ptarmigan, and went on with Grant, while the others remained with me, taking the greatest care of me. Macdonald is a good honest man, and was indefatigable, and poor Batterbury was very anxious also.'

This last extract introduces us to what is one of the most noticeable features of this life in the Highland home—the relations between the Queen and Prince and their Scotch servants. These were of the most friendly nature; and evidently one great charm of days spent so much in the open air and in absolute dependence on the care, skill, and conduct of their attendants, was that the peculiarities of the Highland character made such intimacy possible without any loss of that perfect respect which prevented its ever tending towards familiarity or rudeness. The establishment of such relations fell in exactly with the character both of the Queen and of the Prince. Not the least remarkable amongst those 'Speeches' which first acquainted the people of England generally with the nobleness of the Prince's nature, was that which he delivered in May, 1849, on the foundation of the Servants' Provident Society. How beautiful is the language in which he sketches out what ought in a Christian household to be the relation between the masters and the servants:—

'Who would not feel the deepest interest in the welfare of their domestic servants? Whose heart would fail to sympathise with those who minister to us in all the wants of daily life, attend us in sickness, receive us upon our first appearance in this world, and even extend their cares to our mortal remains; who live under one roof, form one household, and are part of one family?'*

What a noble utterance it is! and how specially needful for these times, when all such bonds as these seem to be too generally relaxing under the influence of a subtle selfishness which conceals its hateful acting under the garb of non-interference on the one side, and independence on the other! How is service elevated from servitude when it is thus baptised with the spirit of mutual regard, of offices rendered with love and received with gratitude, when the personality neither of the master nor the servant is destroyed by their official relations.

No less accordant with the Sovereign's own character is this

* 'Speeches and Addresses of the Prince Consort,' p. 96.

loftier

loftier view of these family relations. Mr. Helps has well remarked on this feature in his introduction, when he notices

'The Patriarchal feeling (if one may apply such a word as "patriarchal" to a lady) which is so strong in the present occupant of the throne. Perhaps there is no person in these realms who takes a more deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the household committed to his charge than our gracious Queen does in hers, or who feels more keenly what are the reciprocal duties of masters and servants.

'Nor does any one wish more ardently than Her Majesty does, that there should be no abrupt severance of class from class, but rather a gradual blending together of all classes—caused by a full community of interests, a constant interchange of good offices, and a kindly respect felt and expressed by each class to all its brethren in the great brotherhood that forms a nation.

'Those whose duty it has been to attend upon the Queen in matters of business must have noticed that Her Majesty, as a person well versed in the conduct of affairs, is wont to keep closely to the point at issue, and to speak of nothing but what is directly connected with the matter before her. But whenever there is an exception to this rule, it arises from Her Majesty's anxious desire to make some inquiry about the welfare of her subjects—to express her sympathy with this man's sorrow, or on that man's bereavement—to ask what is the latest intelligence about this disaster, or that suffering, and what can be done to remedy or assuage it—thus showing, unconsciously, that she is, indeed, the Mother of her People, taking the deepest interest in all that concerns them, without respect of persons, from the highest to the lowest.'—pp. xiv., xv.

With personal attendants, as we commonly find them in England, such intimacy is scarcely possible; and to minds longing to substitute for the wretched hollowness of mere paid services this acceptance, with honour on the one side and love on the other, of the conditions of domestic life, the power of resuming 'patriarchal' relations was evidently most grateful. Instances of it, and of the degree in which every particular of the life and family of such attendants became matter of kindly interest to their royal masters, are perpetually reappearing in this volume. They are such as these:—

'We then came to a place which is always wet, but which was particularly bad after the late rain and snow. There was no pony for for me to get on; and as I wished not to get my feet wet by walking through the long grass, Albert proposed I should be carried over in a plaid; and Lenchen * was first carried over; but it was held too low, and her feet dangled; so Albert suggested the plaid should be put

* Princess Helena.

round

round the men's shoulders, and that I should sit upon it. Brown and Duncan, the two strongest and handiest, were the two who undertook it, and I sat safely enough with an arm on each man's shoulder, and was carried successfully over. All the Highlanders are so amusing, and really pleasant and instructive to talk to—women as well as men—and the latter so gentlemanlike. As we went along I talked frequently with good Grant.'—pp. 168, 169.

'We saw where the Dee rises between the mountains, and such magnificent wild rocks, precipices, and corries. It had a sublime and solemn effect; so wild, so solitary—no one but ourselves and our little party there.

'Albert went on further with the children, but I returned with Grant to my seat on the cairn, as I could not scramble about well. I and Alice rode part of the way, walking wherever it was very steep. Albert and Bertie walked the whole time, Albert talking so gaily with Grant. Upon which Brown observed to me in simple Highland phrase, "It's very pleasant to walk with a person who is always 'content.'" Yesterday, in speaking of dearest Albert's sport, when I observed he never was cross after bad luck, Brown said, "Every one on the estate says there never was so kind a master; I am sure our only wish is to give satisfaction." I said they certainly did.'*—pp. 187, 188.

How well founded was this belief in the Prince's thoughtful kindness towards his attendants comes well out in such a notice as this:—

'At the bridge at Mar Lodge, Brown lit the lanterns. We gave him and Grant our plaids to put on, as we always do when they have walked a long way with us and drive afterwards.'—p. 220.

'Old John Gordon amused Albert by saying, in speaking of the bad road we had gone, "It's something steep and something rough," and "this is the only best," meaning that it was *very* bad—which was a characteristic reply.'—p. 119.

Here is another instance of the personal interest of the Queen and Prince in all that belonged to their attendants:—

'*September* 16, 1850.—We reached the hut on Loch Muich at three o'clock. At half-past four we walked down to the loch, and got into the boat with our people; Duncan Brown,† P. Cotes, and

* 'We were always in the habit of conversing with the Highlanders—with whom one comes so much in contact in the Highlands. The Prince highly appreciated the good-breeding, simplicity, and intelligence, which make it so pleasant, and even instructive to talk to them.'

† 'The same who, in 1858, became my regular attendant out of doors everywhere in the Highlands; who commenced as gillie in 1849, and was selected by Albert and me to go with my carriage. In 1851 he entered our service permanently, and began in that year leading my pony, and advanced step by step by his good conduct and intelligence. His attention, care, and faithfulness cannot be exceeded;

and Leys rowing. They rowed mostly towards the opposite side, which is very fine indeed, and deeply furrowed by the torrents, which form glens and corries where birch and alder trees grow close to the water's edge.

'The moon rose, and was beautifully reflected on the lake, which, with its steep green hills, looked lovely. To add to the beauty, poetry, and wildness of the scene, Cotes * played in the boat; the men, who row very quickly and well now, giving an occasional shout when he played a reel. It reminded me of Sir Walter Scott's lines in the 'Lady of the Lake':

> "Ever, as on they bore, more loud
> And louder rung the pibroch proud.
> At first the sound, by distance tame,
> Mellow'd along the waters came,
> And, lingering long by cape and bay,
> Wail'd every harsher note away."

We were home at a little past seven; and it was so still and pretty as we entered the wood, and saw the light flickering from our humble little abode.'—pp. 129, 130.

'*September* 12, 1850.—We went with the children and all our party to the Gathering at the Castle of Braemar, as we did last year. There were the usual games of "putting the stone," "throwing the hammer," and "caber," and racing up the hill of Craig Cheunnich, which was accomplished in less than six minutes and a half; and we were all much pleased to see our gillie Duncan,† who is an active, good-looking young man, win. He was far before the others the whole way. It is a fearful exertion. Mr. Farquharson brought him up to me afterwards.'—p. 124.

'Duncan, in spite of all his exertions yesterday, and having besides walked to and from the Gathering, was the whole time in the water.'—p. 125.

---

exceeded; and the state of my health, which of late years has been sorely tried and weakened, renders such qualifications most valuable, and indeed most needful, in a constant attendant upon all occasions. He has since most deservedly been promoted to be an upper servant, and my permanent personal attendant. (December, 1865.) He has all the independence and elevated feelings peculiar to the Highland race, and is singularly straightforward, simple-minded, kind-hearted, and disinterested; always ready to oblige; and of a discretion rarely to be met with. He is now in his fortieth year. His father was a small farmer, who lived at the Bush on the opposite side to Balmoral. He is the second of nine brothers—three of whom have died—two are in Australia and New Zealand, two are living in the neighbourhood of Balmoral; and the youngest, Archie (Archiebald) is valet to our son Leopold, and is an excellent, trustworthy young man.'

* 'Now, since some years, piper to Farquharson of Invercauld.'

† 'One of our keepers since 1851: an excellent, intelligent man, much liked by the Prince. He, like many others, spit blood after running the race up that steep hill in this short space of time, and he has never been so strong since. The running up hill has in consequence been discontinued. He lives in a cottage at the back of Craig Gowan (commanding a beautiful view) called Robrech, which the Prince built for him.'

Here

Here is an incident of the same temper with the Duke of Athole:

'Where the road for carriages ends, and the glen widens, were our ponies. There we saw old Peter Frazer, the former head-keeper there, now walking with the aid of two sticks!

'We started on our ponies, the Duke and his men (twelve altogether) on foot—Sandy McAra, now head-keeper, grown old and grey, and two pipers, preceded us; the two latter playing alternately the whole time, which had a most cheerful effect. The wild strains sounded so softly amid those noble hills; and our caravan winding along—our people and the Duke's, all in kilts, and the ponies made altogether a most picturesque scene.

'One of the Duke's keepers, Donald Macbeath, is a guardsman, and was in the Crimea. He is a celebrated marksman, and a fine-looking man, as all the Duke's men are. For some little time it was easy riding, but soon we came to a rougher path, more on the "brae" of the hill, where the pony required to be led, which I always have done, either when it is at all rough or bad, or when the pony has to be got on faster.

'The Duke walked near me the greater part of the time; amusingly saying, in reference to former times, that he did not offer to lead me, as he knew I had no confidence in him. I replied, laughingly, "Oh, no, only I like best being led by the person I am accustomed to."

'. . . . Lunched at a place called Dalcronachie, looking up a glen towards Loch Loch—on a high bank overhanging the Tilt. A few minutes brought us to the celebrated ford of the Tarff (Poll Tarff it is called), which is very deep, and after heavy rain almost impassable. The Duke offered to lead the pony on one side, and talked of Sandy for the other side, but I asked for Brown (whom I have far the most confidence in) to lead the pony, the Duke taking hold of it (as he did frequently) on the other side. Sandy McAra, the guide, and the two pipers went first, playing all the time. To all appearance the ford of the Tarff was not deeper than the other fords, but once in it the men were above their knees—and suddenly in the middle, where the current, from the fine, high, full falls, is very strong, it was nearly up to the men's waists. Here Sandy returned, and I said to the Duke (which he afterwards joked with Sandy about) that I thought he (Sandy) had better take the Duke's place; he did so, and we came very well through, all the others following, the men chiefly wading—Albert (close behind me) and the others riding through.'

Nor was this interest in their attendants confined to, though it was so eminently drawn forth by, the Highlanders. Here is a note of the first stay at Alt-na-Giuthasach:—

'Margaret French, my maid Caroline's maid, Löhlein,* Albert's valet,

* 'This faithful and trusty valet nursed his dear master most devotedly through his sad illness in December, 1861, and is now always with me as my personal groom of the chambers or valet. I gave him a house near Windsor Castle, where he resides when the Court are there. He is a native of Coburg. His father has been for fifty years Förster at Fülbach, close to Coburg.'

a cook,

a cook, Shackle,* and Macdonald, are the only persons with us in the house, old John Gordon and his wife excepted.'—p. 112.

'The scenery is beautiful here, so wild and grand—real severe Highland scenery, with trees in the hollow. We had various scrambles in and out of the boat and along the shore, and saw three hawks and caught seventy trout. I wish an artist could have been there to sketch the scene; it was so picturesque—the boat, the net, and the people in their kilts in the water and on the shore. In going back Albert rowed and Macdonald steered: and the lights were beautiful.

'After dinner we walked round the little garden. The silence and solitude, only interrupted by the waving of the fir-trees, were very solemn and striking.'—p. 113.

Such natural kindness must indeed have won the hearts of a people so constitutionally loyal as the Highlanders, and throw back a stream of sunshine on the daily life of those whose height of station too commonly robs them of the richer colouring which belongs to the lower valleys; neither was it confined to the immediate members of the Royal household. Here is to us a delightful entry:—

'*Saturday, September* 26, 1857.—Albert went out with Alfred for the day, and I walked out with the two girls and Lady Churchill, stopped at the shop and made some purchases for poor people and others; drove a little way, got out and walked up the hill to Balnacroft, Mrs. P. Farquharson's, and she walked round with us to some of the cottages to show me where the poor people lived and to tell them who I was. Before we went into any we met an old woman, who, Mrs. Farquharson said, was very poor, eighty-eight years old, and mother to the former distiller. I gave her a warm petticoat, and the tears rolled down her old cheeks, and she shook my hands and prayed God to bless me: it was very touching.

'I went into a small cabin of old Kitty Kear's, who is eighty-six years old—quite erect, and who welcomed us with a great air of dignity. She sat down and spun. I gave her also a warm petticoat. She said, "May the Lord ever attend ye and yours, here and hereafter; and may the Lord be a guide to ye, and keep ye from all harm." She was quite surprised at Vicky's height; great interest is taken in her. We went on to a cottage (formerly Jean Gordon's), to visit old widow Symons, who is "past fourscore," with a nice rosy face, but was bent quite double; she was most friendly, shaking hands with us all, asking which was I, and repeating many kind blessings: "May the Lord attend ye with mirth and with joy; may He ever be with ye in this world, and when ye leave it." To Vicky, when told she was going to be married, she said, "May the Lord be a guide to ye in your future, and may every happiness attend ye." She was very talkative; and when I said I hoped to see her again, she expressed an expectation that "she should be called any day," and so did Kitty Kear.†

* 'Who was very active and efficient. He is now a Page.' † 'She died in Jan. 1865.'

'We

'We went into three other cottages: to Mrs. Symons's (daughter-in-law to the old widow living next door), who had an "unwell boy;" then across a little burn to another old woman's; and afterwards peeped into Blair, the fiddler's. We drove back and got out again to visit old Mrs. Grant (Grant's mother), who is so tidy and clean, and to whom I gave a dress and handkerchief, and she said, "You're too kind to me, you're over kind to me, ye give me more every year, and I get older every year." After talking some time with her, she said, "I am happy to see ye looking so nice." She had tears in her eyes, and speaking of Vicky's going, said, "I'm very sorry, and I think she is sorry hersel';" and, having said she feared she would not see her (the Princess) again, said: "I am very sorry I said that, but I meant no harm; I always say just what I think, not what is fut" (fit). Dear old lady; she is such a pleasant person.

'Really the affection of these good people, who are so hearty and so happy to see you, taking interest in everything, is very touching and gratifying.'—pp. 161-163.

Here, to vary the scene, comes in what cannot fail to interest all our lady readers: the very form and words of that utterance at all times, even to Royal lips, most difficult to frame—a proposal:—

'*September* 29, 1855.—Our dear Victoria was this day engaged to Prince Frederick William of Prussia, who had been on a visit to us since the 14th. He had already spoken to us, on the 20th, of his wishes; but we were uncertain, on account of her extreme youth, whether he should speak to her himself, or wait till he came back again. However, we felt it was better he should do so; and during our ride up Craig-na-Ban this afternoon, he picked a piece of white heather (the emblem of "good luck"), which he gave to her; and this enabled him to make an allusion to his hopes and wishes, as they rode down Glen Girnoch, which led to this happy conclusion.' —p. 154.

Here are some of their healthy amusements, some of them requiring spirit enough to enter into them. Many a fine lady, we suspect, would shrink from taking the Queen's share in a 'drive' in the Balloch Buie:—

'*September* 18, 1848.—We mounted our ponies, Bertie riding Grant's pony on the deer-saddle, and being led by a gillie, Grant walking by his side. Macdonald and several gillies were with us, and we were preceded by Bowman and old Arthur Farquharson, a deer-stalker of Invercauld's. They took us up a beautiful path winding through the trees and heather in the Balloch Buie; but when we had got about a mile or more they discovered deer. A "council of war" was held in a whisper, and we turned back and went the whole way down again, and rode along to the keeper's lodge, where we turned up the glen immediately below Craig Daign, through a beautiful part of

of the wood, and went on along the track till we came to the foot of the craig, where we all dismounted.

'We scrambled up an almost perpendicular place to where there was a little *box*, made of hurdles and interwoven with branches of fir and heather, about five feet in height. There we seated ourselves with Bertie, Macdonald lying in the heather near us, watching and quite concealed; some had gone round to beat, and others again were at a little distance. We sat quite still, and sketched a little; I doing the landscape and some trees, Albert drawing Macdonald as he lay there. This lasted for nearly an hour, when Albert fancied he heard a distant sound, and, in a few minutes, Macdonald whispered that he saw stags, and that Albert should wait and take a steady aim. We then heard them coming past. Albert did not look over the box, but through it, and fired through the branches, and then again over the box. The deer retreated; but Albert felt certain he had hit a stag. He ran up to the keepers, and at that moment they called from below that they "had got him," and Albert ran on to see. I waited for a bit; but soon scrambled on with Bertie and Macdonald's help; and Albert joined me directly, and we all went down and saw a magnificent stag, "a royal," which had dropped, soon after Albert had hit him, at one of the men's feet. The sport was successful, and every one was delighted—Macdonald and the keepers in particular;—the former saying, "that it was her Majesty's coming out that had brought the good luck." I was supposed to have "a lucky foot," of which the Highlanders "think a great deal." We walked down to the place we last came up, got into the carriage, and were home by half-past two o'clock.'—pp. 108-110.

Some of the most enjoyable days recorded in the Journal were those on which, all state having been thrown aside, excursions were made under a strict incognito. Here are one or two extracts, put together from different trips of this character:—

'A few seconds brought us over to the road, where there were two shabby vehicles, one a kind of barouche, into which Albert and I got, Lady Churchill and General Grey into the other—a break; each with a pair of small and rather miserable horses, driven by a man from the box. Grant was on our carriage, and Brown on the other. We had gone so far forty miles, at least twenty on horseback. We had decided to call ourselves *Lord and Lady Churchill and party*, Lady Churchill passing as *Miss Spencer*, and General Grey as *Dr. Grey!* Brown once forgot this, and called me "Your Majesty" as I was getting into the carriage; and Grant on the box once called Albert "Your Royal Highness;" which set us off laughing, but no one observed it.

'We had a long three hours' drive.

'Most striking was the utter, and to me very refreshing, solitude. Hardly a habitation! and hardly meeting a soul! It gradually grew dark. We stopped at a small half-way house for the horses to take some

some water; and the few people about stared vacantly at the two simple vehicles.

'The mountains gradually disappeared—the evening was mild, with a few drops of rain. On and on we went, till at length we saw lights, and drove through a long and straggling "toun," and turned down a small court to the door of the inn. Here we got out quickly —Lady Churchill and General Grey not waiting for us. We went up a small staircase, and were shown to our bed-room at the top of it—very small, but clean—with a large four-post bed which nearly filled the whole room. Opposite was the drawing and dining-room in one—very tidy and well-sized. Then came the room where Albert dressed, which was very small. The two maids (Jane Shackle* was with me) had driven over by another road in the waggonette, Stewart driving them. Made ourselves "clean and tidy," and then sat down to our dinner. Grant and Brown were to have waited on us, but were "bashful" and did not. A ringletted woman did everything; and, when dinner was over, removed the cloth and placed the bottle of wine (our own which we had brought) on the table with the glasses, which was the old English fashion. The dinner was very fair, and all very clean.'—pp. 194-196.

'*Wednesday, September* 5.—A misty, rainy morning. Had not slept very soundly. We got up rather early, and sat working and reading in the drawing-room till the breakfast was ready, for which we had to wait some little time. Good tea and bread and butter, and some excellent porridge. Jane Shackle (who was very useful and attentive) said that they had all supped together, namely, the two maids, and Grant, Brown, Stewart, and Walker (who was still there), and were very merry in the "commercial room." The people were very amusing about us. The woman came in while they were at dinner, and said to Grant, "Dr. Grey wants you," which nearly upset the gravity of all the others: then they told Jane, "Your lady gives no trouble;" and Grant in the morning called up to Jane, "Does his lordship want me?" One could look on the street, which is a very long wide one, with detached houses, from our window. It was perfectly quiet, no one stirring, except here and there a man driving a cart, or a boy going along on his errand. General Grey bought himself a watch in a shop for 2*l.*!

'At length, at about ten minutes to ten o'clock, we started in the same carriages and the same way as yesterday, and drove . . . . . to Tomantoul . . . . . the most tumble-down, poor-looking place I ever saw. . . . . .

'We mounted our ponies a short way out of the town. We came upon a beautiful view, looking down upon the Avon and up a fine glen. There we rested and took luncheon. While Brown was unpacking and arranging our things, I spoke to him and to Grant, who was helping, about not having waited on us, as they ought to have

* 'One of my wardrobe-maids, and daughter to the Page mentioned earlier.'—pp. 197-202.

done,

done, at dinner last night and at breakfast, as we had wished; and Brown answered, he was afraid he should not do it rightly; I replied we did not wish to have a stranger in the room, and they must do so another time.

'. . . . . In order to get on, as it was late, and we had eight miles to ride, our men—at least Brown and two of the others—walked before us at a fearful pace, so that we had to trot to keep up at all. Grant rode frequently on the deer pony; the others seemed, however, a good deal tired with the two long days' journey, and were glad to get on Albert's or the General's pony to give themselves a lift; but their willingness, readiness, cheerfulness, indefatigableness, are very admirable, and make them most delightful servants. As for Grant and Brown they are perfect—discreet, careful, intelligent, attentive, ever ready to do what is wanted; and the latter, particularly, is handy and willing to do everything and anything, and to overcome every difficulty, which makes him one of my best servants anywhere.

'What a delightful, successful expedition! . . . . To my dear Albert do we owe it, for he always thought it would be delightful, having gone on many similar expeditions in former days himself. He enjoyed it very much.'—pp. 197-202.

Here is a second excursion:—

'At a quarter past seven o'clock we reached the small quiet town, or rather village, of Fettercairn, for it was very small—not a creature stirring, and we got out at the quiet little inn, "Ramsay Arms," quite unobserved, and went at once upstairs. There was a very nice drawing-room, and next to it a dining-room, both very clean and tidy—then to the left our bed-room, which was excessively small, but also very clean and neat, and much better furnished than at Grantown. Alice had a nice room, the same size as ours; then came a mere morsel of one (with a "press bed"), in which Albert dressed; and then came Lady Churchill's bed-room just beyond. Louis and General Grey had rooms in an hotel, called "The Temperance Hotel," opposite. We dined at eight, a very nice, clean, good dinner. Grant and Brown waited. They were rather nervous, but General Grey and Lady Churchill carved, and they had only to change the plates, which Brown soon got into the way of doing. A little girl of the house came in to help—but Grant turned her round to prevent her looking at us! The landlord and landlady knew who we were, but *no one else* except the coachman, and they kept the secret admirably.

'The evening being bright and moonlight and very still, we all went out, and walked through the whole village, where not a creature moved, ... hearing nothing whatever—not a leaf moving—but the distant barking of a dog! Suddenly we heard a drum and fifes! We were greatly alarmed, fearing we had been recognised; but Louis and General Grey, who went back, saw nothing whatever. Still, as we walked slowly back, we heard the noise from time to time—and when

when we reached the inn door we stopped, and saw six men march up with fifes and a drum (not a creature taking any notice of them), go down the street, and back again. Grant and Brown were out, but had no idea what it could be. Albert asked the little maid, and the answer was, "It's just a band," and that it walked about in this way twice a week. How odd! It went on playing some time after we got home. We sat till half-past ten working, and Albert reading—and then retired to rest.'—pp. 209-211.

'*Saturday, September* 21.—Got to sleep after two or three o'clock. The morning was dull and close, and misty, with a little rain; hardly any one stirring; but a few people at their work. A traveller had arrived at night, and wanted to come up into the dining-room, which is the "commercial travellers' room;" and they had difficulty in telling him he could *not* stop there. He joined Grant and Brown at their tea, and on his asking "What's the matter here?" Grant answered, "It's a wedding party from Aberdeen." At "the Temperance Hotel" they were very anxious to know whom they had got. All, except General Grey, breakfasted a little before nine. Brown acted as my servant, brushing my skirt and boots, and taking any message, and Grant as Albert's valet.

'At a quarter to ten we started the same way as before.' . . . .—pp. 211-212.

'At Kingussie there was a small, curious, chattering crowd of people—who, however, did not really make us out, but evidently suspected who we were. Grant and Brown kept them off the carriages, and gave them evasive answers, directing them to the wrong carriage, which was most amusing. One old gentleman, with a high wide-awake, was especially inquisitive.

'We started again, and went on and on, passing through the village of Newton of Benchar, where the footman McDonald * comes from.'—p. 225.

In the midst of these scenes of family affection, amusement, and repose, the distant sounds of the great world, of which those withdrawn persons were yet the living heart, come upon our ears with a solemnity and strangeness of intrusion. Here is one of rejoicing:—

'*September* 10, 1855.—All were in constant expectation of more telegraphic despatches. At half-past ten o'clock two arrived—one for me, and one for Lord Granville. I began reading mine, which was from Lord Clarendon, with details from Marshal Pélissier, of the further destruction of the Russian ships; and Lord Granville said, "I have still better news;" on which he read, "From General Simpson—*Sevastopol is in the hands of the Allies.*" God be praised for it.'—p. 151.

* 'He died at Abergeldie, last year, of consumption; and his widow, an excellent person, daughter of Mitchell, the blacksmith, at Balmoral, is now my wardrobe-maid.'

Here

Here is a second instance, in another tone; one which will be read with interest wherever the English tongue or any translation of it can be read:—

'*Alt-na-Giuthasach, Thursday, September* 16, 1852.—We were startled this morning at seven o'clock, by a letter from Colonel Phipps, enclosing a telegraphic despatch with the report from the sixth edition of the "Sun," of the Duke of Wellington's death the day before yesterday, which report, however, we did not at all believe. Would to God that we had been right; and that this day had not been cruelly saddened in the afternoon.

'We walked a long way on the top of the very steep hills overhanging the loch . . . . . Here I suddenly missed my watch, which the dear old Duke had given me; and, not being certain whether I had put it on or not, I asked Mackenzie * to go back and inquire. We walked on until we reached the higher part of the Glassalt. . . .

'Then we began the descent of the Glassalt.

'We got off our ponies, and I had just sat down to sketch, when Mackenzie returned, saying my watch was safe at home, and bringing letters: amongst them there was one from Lord Derby, which I tore open, and alas! it contained the confirmation of the fatal news, that England's, or rather Britain's pride, her glory, her hero, the greatest man she ever had produced, was no more. Sad day! Great and irreparable national loss!

'Lord Derby enclosed a few lines from Lord Charles Wellesley, saying that his dear great father had died on Tuesday at three o'clock, after a few hours' illness and no suffering. God's will be done! The day must have come; the Duke was eighty-three. It is well for him that he has been taken when still in the possession of his great mind, and without a long illness,—but what a *loss!* One cannot think of this country without "the Duke,"—our immortal hero!

'In him centered almost every earthly honour a subject could possess. His position was the highest a subject ever had,—above party,—looked up to by all,—revered by the whole nation,—the friend of the Sovereign,—and *how* simply he carried these honours! With what singleness of purpose, what straightforwardness, what courage, were all the motives of his actions guided. The Crown never possessed—and I fear never *will*—so *devoted*, loyal, and faithful a subject, so staunch a supporter! To *us* (who, alas! have lost now so many of our valued and experienced friends), his loss is *irreparable*, for his readiness to aid and advise, if it could be of use to us, and to overcome any and every difficulty, was unequalled. To Albert he showed the greatest kindness and the utmost confidence. His experience and his knowledge of the past were so great too; he was a link which connected us with bygone times, with the last century. Not an eye will be dry in the whole country.

'We hastened down on foot to the head of Loch Muich; and then

* 'One of our keepers, and a very good man; he lives at Alt-na-Giuthasach.'

rode

rode home, in a heavy shower, to Alt-na-Giuthasach. Our whole enjoyment was spoilt; a gloom overhung all of us.

'We wrote to Lord Derby and Lord Charles Wellesley.'—pp. 134-138.

Amidst all the utterances of politicians, historians, and poets, there is to our mind a grandeur of its own in the simplicity of these words of sorrow from the throne of England.

It is easy, even without knowing the weight of those golden chains of reserve and ceremony with which kings are fettered, to imagine the enjoyments which such an interlude in Royal life as Balmoral afforded when its halls were lighted with that brightness of family affection which played so continually there. For, amidst all the keen relish for nature and for freedom which these pages betray, still the one ever prevailing sentiment of every page of the Journal is the love of the appreciating wife for the grand husband whom Providence had given her. Always this is re-appearing. The 'love for Balmoral' itself based itself on this far deeper affection:—

'*October* 13, 1856.—Every year my heart becomes more fixed in this dear Paradise, and so much more so now, that *all* has become my dearest Albert's *own* creation, own work, own building, own laying out, as at Osborne; and his great taste, and the impress of his dear hand, have been stamped everywhere. He was very busy to-day, settling and arranging many things for next year.'—p. 58.

There is a continual perception of his love of learning everything which was to be learned:—

'We rode the whole way, and Albert only walked the last two miles. He took a Gaelic lesson during our ride, asking Macdonald, who speaks it with great purity, many words, and making him talk to Jemmie Coutts. Albert has already picked up many words.'

His shortest absence clouded all the scene:—

'*September* 14, 1859.—I felt very low-spirited at my dearest Albert having to leave at one o'clock for Aberdeen, to preside at the meeting of the British Association.'—p. 172.

'So sad not to find my darling husband at home.'

We can conceive some critics finding fault with such revelations as these. But we believe them to be entirely wrong in their estimate of man's nature, and we are confident that the general assent of all deeper minds will reverse their sentence.

To numbers amongst her subjects these unintentional delineations of the character and mode of life of the highest persons in the realm—thorough sun-pictures as they are, catching the passing emotions of the hour, and writing them down with a

 passionless

passionless exactness—will be not a little welcome. Their effect must be to quicken the emotions of that loyalty which at this moment, more than almost any other, is of such value to this nation. For they substitute for the lifeless names of king and queen the living queenly Person to whom the abstract theory of loyalty must, unless it is a very cold abstraction indeed, be able to attach itself. They show her as the mistress of her household, entering with a most unusual affectionateness of care into the individual welfare of every attendant on her person; as, even in the disturbances of a tour, herself teaching her Royal children; as mingling, by a most natural transition, with these domestic duties the cares of the Head of the larger family of the State; above all, they show her as a loving wife, delighting in her husband's companionship; proud, as a wife should be, of his grace and intellect; admiring his noble person; entering with intense zest into all his successes, from the triumph of the successful deer-stalk to his winning the applauses of the gathered scientific sages:—

'*September* 15, 1859.—I heard by telegram last night that Albert's reception was admirable, and that all was going off as well as possible. Thank God.'—p. 175.

'All the gentlemen spoke in very high terms of my beloved Albert's admirable speech, the good it had done, and the general satisfaction it had caused.'—p. 179.

And alas!—we must say it—for this land, and alas! for that true mother, wife, and queen, they shew her—when the blow had fallen and the pall was drawn over that life of love,—suffering as none can suffer but one in that height of station which for the most part is barren of such happiness as she knew, and which by its very exaltation leaves her now with a consciousness of loneliness which not even such a bereavement would bring upon the humblest of her subjects. How touching is such an entry as this!—

'Grant told me in May, 1862, that, when the Prince stopped behind with him, looking at the Choils which he intended as a deer-forest for the Prince of Wales, and giving his directions as to the planting in Glen Muich, he said to Grant, "You and I may be dead and gone before that." In less than three months, alas! his words were verified as regards himself! He was ever cheerful, but ever ready and prepared.'

The heart of any man must be judicially hardened who can read without emotion the last entry of the last Highland excursion:—

'We went back on our side of the river; and if we had been a little

little earlier Albert might have got a stag, but it was too late. The moon rose and shone most beautifully, and we returned at twenty minutes to seven o'clock, much pleased and interested with this delightful expedition. Alas! I fear our *last* great one! (*It was our last one!*—1867.')—p. 244.

The only words which can follow this entry are those in which the royal writer pours forth in the dedication of the volume the whole of her heart:—

'To the dear memory of him who made the life of the writer bright and happy, these simple records are lovingly and gratefully inscribed.'

ART. III.—1. *The Ordinance of Confession.* By William Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield. 2nd Edition, London, 1852.

2. *Manual for Confession.* Oxford and London, 1858.

3. *The Doctrine of Confession in the Church of England.* By the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer, Berks. London, 1865.

4. *The Church and the World: Essays on Questions of the Day, &c.* (2nd Series.) London, 1867.

   Essay 7. *Private Confession and Absolution.* By the Rev. John Charles Chambers, M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mary the Virgin, Crown-Street, Soho.

   Essay 11. *A Layman's View of Confession.* By John David Chambers, M.A., Recorder of Salisbury.

5. *The Priest in Absolution: a Manual for such as are called unto the Higher Ministries in the English Church.* Part I. London, 1866.

6. *The Ministry of Consolation: a Guide to Confession, for the Use of Members of the Church in England.* 2nd Edition. London, 1867.

7. *Pardon through the Precious Blood: or the Benefit of Absolution, and How to obtain it.* Edited by a Committee of Clergy. Ninth Thousand. London, 1867.

8. *Repentance: a Manual of Prayer and Instruction.* Edited by the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A. Oxford and London, 1867.

9. *A Companion to the Book of Common Prayer.* 2nd Edition. London, 1867.

10. *The Little Prayer Book: intended chiefly for Beginners in Devotion.* Revised and corrected by three Priests. Fifth Thousand. London, 1867.

e Day: Essays on Theological Subjects. By
s. No. 1: *Priestly Absolution, Scriptural.*
ev. Orby Shipley, M.A. 2nd Edition. London,

In the year 1850, three beneficed clergymen of the diocese of London sought the advice of Bishop Blomfield as to the practice of private confession. The Bishop, in his reply, went at some length into the subject, but his opinion is virtually summed up in the following words:—

'It seems to me that the Church of England does not encourage frequent or periodical private confession, the danger of abusing which is so obvious as not to require pointing out; but that she does not forbid her members to have recourse to private confession on what may be termed great spiritual emergencies; that cases when such confession is proper are exceptional cases; that it is an indulgence to human weakness rather than a duty; and that men are not to be exhorted or even invited to perform it, except in the specific instances for which provision is made in the offices of the Church. I think that such confession should be wholly and in all its parts voluntary and spontaneous, and that the minister to whom it is made should forbear from those particular inquiries which lead to the abominations of the Romish confessional. So guarded, I do not think that private confession ought to be entirely condemned.' *

Bishop Blomfield was never considered a Low Churchman, yet it is matter of notoriety that such moderate counsels as these would now be branded by a large party as inconsistent with any deep or adequate appreciation of the Church system. It is in order to bring out into full prominence the vast advance which has taken place of late years in the manner of speaking and writing on this matter that we have prefaced our paper with the Bishop's rescript.

We may add the words of Bishop Phillpotts, who thus writes in his letters to the late Charles Butler, 'On the Insuperable Differences which separate the Church of England from the Church of Rome,' p. 106:—

'You know that auricular confession is, with you, an essential part of a sacrament, which, as you value your soul's salvation, you must perform. You also know that, with us, the same confession is not at all required as a necessary service, not as a part of repentance, not even of discipline: that it is merely a matter recommended to those sinners whose troubled conscience admits not of being quieted by

* Cited in 'Dr. Stephens' Edition of the Prayer Book with Notes,' vol. iii., p. 1663.

self-

self-examination however close and searching, nor any other instruction however diligent; that he only who "*requireth further comfort or counsel*," after all he can do for himself, is invited to repair "to some discreet and learned Minister of God's word and *open his grief;* that *by the Ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution* together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."'

We shall now contrast these views with those of our modern Ritualists, allowing them, as the fairest course, to speak for themselves.

Mr. J. D. Chambers says:—

'As, then, it is upon this sole infallible warrant and authority of the United Catholic Church of Christ of the three or four first centuries especially, continued during subsequent ages, that the believer receives as a fundamental of Christianity, and as beyond all doubt, the greater fact of the inspiration of all Holy Scripture; so is he bound by a necessary consequence, on the same infallible warrant and authority, to accept the minor fact, that confession of sins after baptism to this Church, and so to Christ, in the person of His priests or "presbyters," the performance of a penance, if enjoined by them, and the Absolution or remission of sins given and pronounced by them (upon condition of the contrition of the penitent) in the place and stead and with the authority of Christ himself, is a Divine institution of universal obligation—a portion of, and necessary to, a true repentance, having an equal claim upon his acceptance and obedience with Holy Scripture itself.' *

Another writer considers the view of our English divines to be—

'That if a man have committed any mortal sin, then we *require* confession of it to a priest.' †

An anonymous Ritualistic work says,—

'Many of those who use confession, use it with but little devotion or heartfelt contrition; and as they come not to the Ordinance with proper dispositions, they in consequence derive little or no benefit from its use. Now, whoever has committed a deadly sin, has the gates of Paradise closed against him. But in this Holy Ordinance our Saviour Christ has deposited His most precious Blood, to be a life-giving fountain to wash our souls from the filth of sin, to heal them of their wounds, to strengthen and comfort them in their weaknesses and infirmities, and to enrich them with His grace. . . . . Go, then, often to confession; and if you should have the grievous misfortune to fall into deadly sin, go *at once*. Do not, do not think of living for one single moment in mortal sin; lest death should come upon you

* 'A Layman's view of Confession,' p. 349.
† Private Confession and Absolution,' p. 222.

whilst

while in this state and cast you into hell fire for eternity. By means of a good Confession with Repentance and Faith, the soul is again freed from the bondage of the Devil, the chains are broken, you become again the child of God and are restored to God's grace, which was lost by sin: and you obtain strength to keep you from falling again.' *

Another writer says:—

'Under the Jewish law sin was to be confessed over the head of the animal slain as a sin-offering in token that its guilt was thus transferred to the victim: and the priest then made an atonement for the sinner by sprinkling some of the blood of the sacrifice upon the altar. The penitent was then forgiven. In the manner, under the Christian covenant, confession to a priest is appointed as the means of approaching God, and obtaining of Him forgiveness of deadly sin.' †

Another authority speaks thus:—

'Our recognised rule, then, following the uniform tradition of the Church, affirms the individual ministry of reconciliation to be the proper and ordinary means of remission of grievous and deadly sins, and therefore morally obligatory in such cases, yet without denying the possibility of forgiveness without it. On this ground the Priest is ordered to "move" the sick person to confession, should his case be of this nature. It is lest he should lose the means specially ordained as a remedy for his great need. . . . . While, however, this rule has been thus fixed, determining the cases in which confession is to be regarded as obligatory, we must bear in mind how difficult it often is to draw any clear and certain line between classes or degrees of sin; how obstruse the distinctions between venial and mortal sins; how great the tendency of venial to lead to mortal; the possibility of the mere accumulation of venial sins constituting a state equivalent to mortal sin, and the manifold dangers of self-deception in such a momentous case.' ‡

The 'Little Prayer Book' gives a list of six 'Precepts of the Church' [of England], the third of which is 'To confess our sins to our pastor, or some other priest, each time our conscience is burdened by mortal sin.' §

Plain-spoken words, these, certainly. They indicate nothing less than the existence of an organised party bent upon re-introducing a yoke which, as we of this generation have been wont to believe, our fathers in the sixteenth century were unable to bear,

* 'Manual for Confession,' p. 1. † 'Repentance,' p. 11.

‡ Carter, 'Doctrine of Confession,' p. 224.

§ Surely it is idle to speak of confession as only obligatory in case of mortal sin, if the penitent be hopelessly unable to tell for himself what sin is mortal and what venial! It would be simpler to say at once that he is in every case to confess everything.

and

and which their sons in the nineteenth would be even less likely to tolerate. But, startling or not, the existence of such a party, and the reality and persistency of its operations, can no longer be denied. Nothing, therefore, remains but to accept the offered challenge, and to join issue on the point whether such doctrines are really those of the Church of England.

If, in the inquiry which thus becomes necessary, we should seem to go more into theological details than is usual in the pages of a Review intended for general readers, our excuse must be found in the exigencies of the subject. 'Tua res agitur' may in the present case be said to every lay member of the Church. Vestments and ceremonies may offend our religious feelings, but the practice of confession threatens our domestic peace.

The fact is, that the Ritualistic school have so pertinaciously asserted in conversations, in sermons, and through the Press, that they alone represent the true system of the Anglican Church, and are simply reviving it after an unauthorised disuse, that society in very weariness is beginning to yield something like an assent to the claim. This, indeed, of itself proves nothing; society is not very discriminating in its beliefs:—

> 'For say a foolish thing but oft enough
> (And here's the secret of a hundred creeds—
> Men get opinions as boys learn to spell,
> By re-iteration chiefly), the same thing
> Shall pass at last for absolutely wise,
> And not with fools exclusively.' *

Yet a certain effect is produced on the whole, though a different one with different minds. Those who are warmly attached to their Church, and place an implicit trust in her wisdom, while they think but little for themselves on religious topics, are fascinated by the power of strong assertions. The Church has said it—the Church must know best. While this notion remains unshaken in their minds, they yield an unwilling ear and no real credence to objections against the confessional on social grounds. These, they say, tell only against abuses; they prove nothing against a legitimate use, otherwise the Church would not have sanctioned it. With another class practical objections are everything. They feel strongly the evils of confession, but then they are not accustomed to look into Church questions, and they have no answer ready when Church authority is put forward. Nothing will induce them to favour the system; but they are restless and uneasy from a suspicion that, after all, the Prayer Book may be with their opponents. To such, and

* 'Aurora Leigh.' By E. Barrett Browning.

possibly

possibly to others, we may be doing some service in taking the course we have indicated.

The question before us is, Do such statements as we have cited really represent the views of the Church of England? Let us look into our Prayer Books. One of the passages most relied on is at the close of the Exhortation to be read in giving notice of the Holy Communion. Before examining it, we must make the preliminary remark that, though it is appointed to be used in all ordinary cases, there is, in fact, another address provided in case the people are negligent to come to the Communion. And this is very material; because, if confession were the great remedy for sin,—the great means to fit men living worldly lives for the reception of the Sacrament,—the careless persons addressed in this special exhortation would be just those on whom it would be most expedient to enforce it; whereas, in point of fact, there is no mention of it from the beginning to the end of *this* address. The passage so often quoted on the subject occurs in the ordinary Exhortation, which we now proceed to examine. That we may read it more intelligently, we premise one word as to the doctrine prevailing before and up to the Reformation as to preparation for communion. The recognised and only way to the due reception of the sacrament of the altar was through the sacrament of penitence; and the part of the penitent therein was defined to consist of contrition, confession, and satisfaction. Confession, it was ruled, must of necessity be made to a priest; and satisfaction was held to consist, not mainly or primarily in restitution for injuries done to men, but in the performance of penances enjoined as a compensation for the affront offered by sin to the honour and justice of God. This being so, let us now look at the 'way and means' to become worthy partakers, as laid down by the Church of England. We find a division or enumeration closely corresponding to that of which we have just spoken, but two of the three parts have undergone a great change of signification. Thus, for contrition we have the bewailing of sinfulness, which is, no doubt, much the same as before; but for confession we have the direction to confess to God, the intervention of the priest being ignored; and under the third head we find it laid down that there is to be an amendment of life, and, in case of offences against men, a readiness to make restitution and satisfaction; but of satisfaction to the justice of God by penance we hear not a word. The parallel is remarkable, and the alterations proportionately striking. Such, then, is 'penitence' according to the Church of England. She does not include in it confession to man. If further confirmation of this be wanted, we find it in the subsequent address to the communicants,

communicants, where the way to receive with 'a truly penitent heart' is re-stated. They are told to judge themselves, lest they be judged of the Lord; and repentance, faith, amendment of life, charity, and thanksgiving are inculcated. 'So,' it is said, 'shall ye be meet partakers;' 'so,' without one word of confession save to God.

The matter is sometimes put as if the only change made at the Reformation were that confession was no longer made compulsory, but was still advised and recommended. It seems to be overlooked that the very object of the passages we are now considering is to advise and recommend: and the point we insist upon is, that in such advice confession is not prescribed as the universal, or even the ordinary means of preparation for communion. But if not ordinarily to be used on that occasion, then assuredly not to be put forward as a general discipline in daily life; for it has always been in connexion with the communion that confession has been pre-eminently insisted upon.

But, it is said, does not the Exhortation in question speak of opening the grief of the conscience to the Minister? No doubt it does, but as a proviso for those who cannot quiet their consciences by the ordinary means—for doubting, scrupulous minds—as the exception, therefore, not the rule. This is manifest on the face of the passage.

The very turn of the sentence points to an exceptional case: '*If there be* any of you who by this means cannot,' &c.; so when the banns are asked, and the Minister says, '*If any of you* know any cause or just impediment,' he is not in the habit of expecting that the congregation will rise *en masse* to forbid them: or, to go no further than the paragraph next before that which we are discussing, we have '*If any of you* be a blasphemer,' which surely is not expected to be the normal case in an assembly of Christian people.

But we shall not fully see the meaning of the Exhortation we are considering, unless we take into account not only what it contains, but what it does not contain. In the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. there was a distinct reference to auricular confession; and those who were 'satisfied with a general confession' were required 'not to be offended with them that do use to their further satisfying the auricular and secret confession to the priest.' These words have now disappeared, and the term 'minister of God's word' has taken the place of 'priest.' In the same Prayer-book there was a rubric which followed the absolution of the sick, and directed that 'the same form of absolution' was to be used 'in all private confessions.' This, also, has been expunged;

punged; surely the spirit of such alterations is sufficiently obvious.*

Perhaps the point at issue between the Ritualist school and those who hold the views of Bishop Blomfield, cannot be more shortly stated than by the question, Does the Church mean that men *ought* to be unable to 'quiet their own consciences' without resorting to confession? The former, of course, take the affirmative side; they admit that confession is not compulsory; but they make it morally obligatory.

Thus the 'Companion to the Book of Common Prayer,' while laying it down that the Church leaves it 'optional' (p. 35), proceeds within a few lines thus:—

'With respect to habitual confession, it will be seen that the Prayer Book expresses no opinion, but the unanimous teaching of the most eminent bishops and theologians of the English Church since the Reformation,† as well as that of the whole Catholic Church, is that such a practice is highly expedient and beneficial as a means of self-discipline. And as we have elsewhere shewn that children, when properly instructed, ought to be admitted to Confirmation and Communion, and since such strict self-examination is required as a prerequisite, it will follow that such children must ordinarily stand in need of more "comfort and counsel" than they can give themselves. So that habitual confession is indirectly recommended by the Prayer Book for children,‡ while adults are exhorted to come to confession whenever they want "further comfort and counsel," however often that may be. A proper chair, according to the ancient pattern, should be provided in the sacristy, and set times for hearing confessions be publicly specified. The priest should sit, and be vested in a surplice, violet stole, and biretta, the penitent should kneel, the Sarum form should be used, except that the names of the Saints should be omitted, and the present Absolution substituted for the old one.'—p. 36.

When we duly consider this passage, and combine it with the

* It is sometimes urged that because Parliament spoke of the first Prayer Book as compiled 'by the aid of the Holy Ghost,' the second book could not be intended to vary from it in principle. But this phrase did not mean that the first book was infallible, any more than Coverdale assumed infallibility when he spoke of the Holy Ghost as 'the author of' his 'doing' in translating the Bible (2 Cover. Park. Soc. Edit. p. 29). If the principle of everything in the first Prayer Book is still in force, the result will be to legalise exorcism and oil in baptism, the anointing of the sick, the reservation of the elements, the mixture of water with the wine, and prayers for the dead. To most persons, it may be hoped, this will still act as a *reductio ad absurdum*. It may be as well however to add, that the Act which authorised the second prayer book, alleged 'the *mere perfection* of the order of common service' as one reason for the changes then made.

† One cannot help seeing that this unanimity of eminent theologians is secured by the simple process of holding none to be eminent save such as take the author's view.

‡ We trust this specimen of reasoning will not be lost on our readers.

language

language of Mr. Carter previously quoted, we shall probably be of opinion that, whether confession be nominally compulsory or optional, very little 'option' will practically be left; and that the whole force of pastoral influence and authority will be employed to make it habitual and universal.

Now we must really ask how far all this is consistent with a sincere desire to follow out the teaching of the Church. It is evident Mr. Carter himself is not quite at ease on the point:—

'It may be doubted,' he says, 'whether the doctrine here advanced as that of the Church of England, viz., of special Confession and Absolution, though not enjoined of necessity, yet being the ordinary means of remission of deadly sin after baptism, be in accordance with the language of the Exhortation, so often referred to, in giving notice of Holy Communion.'—'Doctrine of Confession,' p. 228.

And, after stating the difficulty very fairly, he gives his answer, which is that any other view is

'Irreconcilable with our Reformers' avowed purpose of a faithful adherence to primitive rule, as well as to positive affirmations in other parts of our formularies, already quoted, as to the virtue and moral obligation in the supposed cases, of the individual ministry of reconciliation.'

As to the other formularies, we shall deal with them presently. As to 'primitive rule,' the present question is, What does the Church of England consider the primitive rule to be? Her authoritative decisions are not to be made on every occasion to bend and give way before what a particular writer may deem to be the ancient doctrine or practice. Many customs which could claim considerable antiquity were held not to be really primitive by the Reformers; and their deliberate decision on this head is set down in the standard documents of the Church, and is not to be controlled by a sort of re-hearing at the bar of individual divines of the very cause on which judgment has been already given and recorded.

And now let us for a few moments look at the matter in a practical view. It is in truth a practical matter, and by no means one of theory only. Mr. Nugee, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Wagner, all avowed the practice of confession in their parishes, when before the Royal Commission on Ritual, and they are but samples of their Ritualist brethren. Instead, therefore, of its conformity with the law of the Church, let us consider its effects on religious and social life. Habitual confession is, or must soon become, indistinguishable from what is known in the Church of Rome as 'spiritual direction,' and has heretofore been looked upon by English writers as among the most

most objectionable parts of the Roman system. Mr. Carter admits this, and does not shrink from it. He says:—

'The same reasoning applies to the question whether habitual direction is sanctioned by our Church. Direction, if viewed simply in its first principles, is implied in "ghostly counsel and advice." The extent or duration of such counsel and advice is of necessity dependent on the circumstances of each individual case; and direction, rightly understood, is but ghostly counsel and advice become habitual.'

The evils popularly associated with 'direction,' such as 'the substitution of the priest's judgment for the true acting of the conscience of the person under his influence,' and the habituating the penitent 'to lean on authority overruling its own powers of action by minute details of rule,' are, he contends, mere abuses. Its end is to 'strengthen and assist the soul in the use of its renewed powers, not destroy them;' but he adds—

'It is impossible, of course, for the Church to direct her priests in the fulfilment of such a charge, any more than she can secure her preachers from indiscretion. Quis custodiet custodes? The possible abuses in the one trust are not greater, or more hurtful, than those incident to the other.'—p. 210.

Judging by the temperate and devout style in which Mr. Carter writes (being most favourably distinguished thereby from some of his school), we dare say that 'direction' in his hands would be less dangerous than in those of most of its advocates; but when he asks (without answering) the question, 'Quis custodiet custodes?' he states what is of itself an unanswerable objection to the exercise of such a secret and far-reaching power by any human being.

He compares it with preaching, but the difference is enormous and vital. The one is public, open to refutation, and possessing no power over the hearers save that which may result from legitimate appeals to their hearts and intellects. The other is hidden, admitting of no correction, because never divulged to others; while, at the same time, it enjoys a terrible and unique power from holding in its grasp the clues to the whole life of the penitent, inward and outward, and possessing the knowledge of secrets which have not been revealed to the nearest and dearest of relatives, which the husband will not tell to the wife, nor the wife to the husband. Are we seriously to be told that mistakes in the exercise of such a power are no worse in their consequences than preaching a bad sermon?

But it is not a mere question of mistake. The clergy are a mixed body, and can claim no universal exemption from human

human frailties. We lay aside now grosser suspicions; but can we hope that no temptations of ambition, no indirect motives of any kind would ever taint the use of their prerogatives as directors? It has not been sufficiently considered that, even if such systems were good in theory for the penitent, they might be inadmissible in practice from the want of perfect men for confessors and directors. In temporal government an absolute despotism gives the largest scope for a perfectly beneficent monarch. But we despair of finding such an one, still more a succession of them, and refuse to entrust our rulers with powers so easily abused.

Will it be said that this is want of faith, and that grace will not be wanting to make the servants of God sufficient for the work to which they are called? Be it so: but where are they called to practise 'direction'? We see no such vocation, and we have always understood that, while confidence with a Divine warrant for it is faith, confidence without it is presumption. To urge such claims at the present moment seems to us suicidal. Thanks to the self-denying labours of many of our clergy (of various schools of thought), the Church has made some way towards regaining the lost affections of the working classes in our large towns. But we believe it will be found that such influence has invariably been acquired by the union of earnest piety with a frank and genial bearing, and the absence of everything like secrecy or concealment. Let us imagine for a moment what would become of this influence, if the working man were given to understand that the visits of his clergyman were to be coupled with the subjection of his wife (for assuredly he would never subject himself) to a mysterious system, which would elicit her most private thoughts and affect all her domestic life. The revulsion would be sharp and sudden; and the cry of priestcraft, so often raised without the shadow of a pretext, would for the first time become more than a prejudice.

Take a higher class. Are not educated men in the thick of a battle in which the very life of Christianity is in question? and is not the war-cry of the opponents, disguised though it be in more polished lips, essentially the same? Is it not the crushing effect of priestly power on the human mind that is perpetually denounced? Shall we then breathe life into this phantom, and make it begin to be a reality? If so, its life will be short, and its fall terrible; it will be the fall of the Church of England.

But suppose it otherwise, and that confessors and directors find a recognised place among us. What will be the effects? We are told that one result will be the obtaining of a most whole-

some

some influence over the boys of our large schools at a dangerous age. But the head-master of one of our large schools,* who both from position and character has every right to speak, has in two striking sermons protested earnestly that in his belief a system of confession would destroy that feeling of mutual confidence which is the band and stay of English school life, and would create either a spirit of resistance or a habit of evasion. We do not wish to underrate any good that confession may be thought to produce, and it is said, we know, that the inclination to sin is checked by the thought of having to reveal it to the priest. But is this safeguard really the fear of God, or of man? and if the latter, is it salutary or truthful for the mind to mix the two together in a way that must make them virtually indistinguishable? And on the other hand must be set the risk of a bad boy lulling his fear of the consequences of sin by the thought that he has *only* to confess it to get absolution.

But in our public schools the director will at all events be the master. There will be no disruption of the links of authority. Whereas, in the family, the parents will know that the daughter —the husband will feel that the wife—intrusts her most sacred thoughts to another ear, and that their advice may be countermined at every turn. This topic, however, has been so often dwelt on elsewhere that we forbear to pursue it, and turn instead to an argument of Mr. J. D. Chambers. That gentleman tells us, on the authority of some statistics which he quotes, that we are about the most criminal and immoral nation in Europe; and he is disposed to consider our neglect of confession to be a main cause of this depravity. But his statistics, not perhaps very certain in themselves, are handled in the most remarkable manner. Thus, under the head of chastity, he compares the illegitimate births in England, Austria, and France, and proposes to show that England is more immoral than the other countries in question, by leaving Vienna and Paris out of the calculation! (p. 390.) The truth seems to be that England stands seventh (or fifth, according to an extract from the 'Economist' in the 'Journal of the Statistical Society,' in 1865) in Europe in this matter, and far above France and Austria. But we cannot go into minutiæ here; it must suffice to say that Mr. Lumley,† from whom the statistics appear to have been drawn, adduces results from his own figures that differ widely from those of Mr. Chambers. He says,—'The

* The Rev. Dr. Pears, of Repton. The sermons though printed are not published, and we do not, therefore, think ourselves justified in doing more than alluding to them.

† In a paper on the Statistics of Illegitimacy, read before the Statistical Society, June, 1862, and printed in their Journal for that year.

result

result appears to the author to be satisfactory, ... he rejoices to find . . . . that this country holds a high position when compared with other countries.' And were it otherwise, it would not follow that confession had anything to do with it. Mr. Lumley expressly remarks :—

'It cannot be said that the religion which prevails in the respective countries affords any satisfactory explanation. The most Catholic country stands high on the list, another closes it. Some of the Protestant countries are placed high, while others are nearly at the bottom.'

The worst case of all is that of Bavaria, a Roman Catholic country; and here Mr. Chambers comes to the rescue of his theory by laying the blame on a bad marriage-law. It may be so; but what is this but to confess that political and social considerations may have more to do with the question than the prevalence of confession?

The truth is, we know too little about confession as practised abroad to speak about it with any great confidence. This, however, is tolerably ascertained, that it is frequented chiefly by women; and how far repugnance to it may repel the men from religion altogether, and particularly from the communion to which it is the preliminary, is a point that may deserve inquiry. It may turn out that a large item on the other side of the account is to be found under this head.

We do not for a moment dispute that ignorance, crime, and vice of all kinds, are far too prevalent among us, and we heartily join in Mr. Chambers' Christian aspirations for the spread of religion among the masses of our people. But we do not think he has shown that confession would conduce to this—indeed, it seems to us that it would be a serious hindrance. We hardly think Ritualists themselves would be so confident in their opinion, if they did not habitually confound confession with all effective pastoral influence, and pour contempt upon the latter unless it embrace the former.* We, on the contrary, would anxiously distinguish them: and, in so doing, would not altogether deny that the cry for confession may possibly testify to a real feeling of want, though suggesting a mistaken remedy. It may be that our clergy, devoting their efforts in the way of private visitation, almost exclusively to the poor, have not cultivated pastoral relations with the rich and educated as much as they might have done. If so, let them seek to restore those relations, and strive to be not only preachers but pastors to all classes of their people. When this is done in earnest, we believe there will be little need

* See 'Church and the World,' 2nd Ser., p. 203.

and

and little desire for anything beyond what the Protestant system recognises and enjoins.

Returning from our long but not useless digression, we now resume our examination of the Prayer Book. We come next to the Commination Service; but this need not delay us. The word 'penance' occurs at the commencement of it, it is true, but in connexion only with persons who 'stand convicted of notorious sin,' and consequently having no bearing on private confession.

We turn, therefore, to the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. What we have specially to notice is the string of the rubrics preceding the absolution. They are as follows:—

In the first place, the minister is to examine the sick man whether he repent him truly of his sins, and to exhort him to forgive offences against himself and to make amends to those whom he has offended. Next, he is to advise him to settle his temporal affairs, and in connexion therewith he is directed 'earnestly to move such sick persons as are of ability to be liberal to the poor.' And then comes the clause—'Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.'

It is said that this directs the minister to urge confession. It seems worth noticing, however, that he is only to 'move,' not to 'move earnestly,' as in the case of charity to the poor. But let that pass. What is more important is that the whole sentence is conditional, and that confession is only to be recommended in case the person is troubled in conscience. In this respect, then, it precisely harmonises with the address in the Communion Service; and it can hardly be doubted that that address affords the true model to be followed in 'moving' the sick man. Any more pressing exhortation would, we conceive, go beyond the spirit and analogy of the teaching of the Church. Here, as in the Communion Service, repentance—the indispensable thing—stands in the first place, and is absolutely required. Here also, as there, confession—the exceptional thing—comes in at the end in a perfectly distinct place, and as a conditional matter only.

But, says the Ritualist, the consciences of the sick must inevitably be troubled with a sense of their sins, and consequently this rubric virtually amounts to a universal injunction. If so, why was it not universal in form? It is incontestable that it recommends confession, not in all cases, but in a special case; just as the rubric before directs sick persons to be moved to liberality—not in every instance, but if they be 'of ability.' Very distinct light is thrown upon this point by the prayers at the end of the Visitation Service, which, as their titles show, are clearly

clearly meant for particular occasions only. Among them we find a prayer 'for persons *troubled* in mind or *in conscience*.' As a matter of practice, we imagine Ritualist clergymen do not as a rule read this prayer to all sick persons. Why then are all sick people to make confession?

Let us now look at the Articles. The XVIth treats expressly of post-baptismal sin. If confession be the true cure for it, this is the place of all others in which we may expect to find it mentioned. What Ritualist divines would have said if they had had to frame such an article, we can guess accurately enough from their works. Thus we read:—

'According to the teaching of the Church from the beginning, sacramental Confession and Absolution is the special means appointed by God for the forgiveness and cleansing away of sin committed after baptism, and of restoring to the soul sanctifying grace.'*

Compare this with the Article, and observe the difference. The Church of England speaks of 'repentance' as the condition of forgiveness, but makes no mention either of confession or penance. And this is the more deserving of notice, because the Ritualist view is just that which prevailed up to the Reformation. The sacrament of penitence was called the second plank after shipwreck, the only means of deliverance for those who had lost their baptismal innocence.† If then our Reformers have varied from this, they must have done so deliberately, having the old theory full before their eyes. But we may carry the case a step further yet. The history of the Articles shows the pains the framers took to weed their language of everything that was even ambiguous on the subject. When the Articles first appeared in the reign of Edward VI., the last clause of the XVIth ran in the Latin, 'damnandi sunt qui . . . . . vere resipiscentibus pœnitentiæ locum denegant.' But when they were finally revised in 1571, and republished in an authorised form both in Latin and in English, this was changed to '*veniæ* locum denegant.' And though in the first clause of the Article the words 'locus pœnitentiæ non est negandus' were retained, care was taken to render this in the English version by 'grant of *repentance*.' Such alterations speak for themselves. They exclude the possibility of taking 'pœnitentiæ' in the technical sense of the schoolmen as the sacrament of penitence, and were doubtless made for the very purpose of excluding it.‡

We

* 'Repentance,' p. 49. † See 'Lyndwood,' lib. v., tit. xvi., p. 327.

‡ This seems the fit place to notice a passage often cited from Archbishop Parker, to the effect that mortal sins are remissible by penance. The passage has

We see, then, that sin is declared to be remissible on repentance. But does any one ask what *is* repentance? May not confession be included in the idea, and form a necessary part of it? A conclusive answer is at hand. The Church has devoted a special homily to the subject—the Homily on Repentance. We shall attempt to give a very brief summary of the rather long argument therein contained.

Repentance is there divided into four parts: contrition, confession, faith, and amendment of life. Confession, we learn, is to be made to God, though indeed it is admitted that we should acknowledge to our brethren our offences against them, and that we may mutually confess our infirmities for the sake of united prayer for forgiveness. It is in this sense, we are told, that what St. James says is to be taken,* and 'the adversaries' are in error when they 'wrest it to maintain their auricular confession withal:'—

'And where that they do allege this saying of our Saviour Jesus Christ unto the leper, to prove auricular confession to stand on God's word, "Go thy way, and show thyself unto the priest," do they not see that the leper was cleansed from his leprosy, before he was by Christ sent unto the priest for to show himself unto him? By the same reason we must be cleansed from our spiritual leprosy, I mean, our sins must be forgiven us, before that we come to confession. What need we then to tell forth our sins into the ear of the priest, sith that they be already taken away?'

Auricular confession is then declared not to have been used in

---

has gone the round of Ritualist writers, and there is nothing which they cite with more exultation. Mr. Cooke (in his 'Power of the Priesthood in Absolution,' Oxford and London, 1858, p. 85) triumphantly says of it, 'This is, indeed, *strong* evidence.' Strong it may be, but we take its strength to be on our side when rightly examined. The facts are these. The archbishop in certain visitation articles treats it as a heresy to say 'that mortal or voluntary sins committed after baptism be not remissible by penance; or that a man, after he have received the Holy Ghost, cannot commit sin; or that afterwards he cannot rise again by grace to repentance; or that any man liveth without sin' (Card. Doc. Ann. i. 341). A glance at the XVIth Article will show that Parker is here closely following what is there laid down, just as he afterwards does in respect to the XXXVIIIth and XXXIXth Articles. Hence there is no reasonable ground to doubt that his 'penance' is meant to correspond to the 'locus pœnitentiæ' in the article. Parker's visitation was in 1567. In 1571, as we have seen, 'locus pœnitentiæ' was in one place changed into 'locus veniæ,' and in the other was authoritatively rendered—not penance, but repentance. It is quite possible that Parker himself did not mean anything more than repentance, for his contemporary Coverdale used the words, as he tells us himself, as synonymous ('Coverdale's Rem.,' Parker Soc. Edit., p. 19); but if he did mean more, his words are no longer of authority. The only remark that remains to be made is that the importance attached by controversialists to these words is the exact measure of the significance of the alterations made in the Article, which have cut away the possibility of alleging them as evidence at the present day.

* James v. 16.

the

the time of St. Augustine, and we are exhorted 'not' to be 'led with the conscience thereof,' but to 'use that kind of confession that God doth command in his Word,' and then doubtless he will forgive us. The passage concludes thus:—

'I do not say but that if any do find themselves troubled in conscience, they may repair to their learned curate or pastor, or to some other godly learned man, and shew the trouble and doubt of their conscience to them that they may receive at their hand the comfortable salve of God's word; but it is against the true Christian liberty that any man should be bound to the numbering of his sins, as it hath been used heretofore in the time of blindness and ignorance.'

In the third place faith is insisted upon, and then lastly we come to amendment of life, *i.e.* 'a new life in bringing forth the fruits of repentance.' This is emphatically declared to be 'the satisfaction that God doth require of us;' and we are reminded that 'this was commonly the penance that Christ enjoined sinners "Go thy way and sin no more."'

Comment on this seems superfluous. We have here at large the very theory which we gathered from the brief words of the Communion Exhortation. Confession is no integral part of penitence, but is superadded for the benefit of scrupulous consciences, and is a spontaneous not a formal thing. Satisfaction, in the scholastic idea of it, and as identical with penance, is rejected. The only admissible sense of it is as equivalent to a new life.

But Ritualism has still an arrow left in its quiver. If it cannot deny the sense of the homilies, it will dispute their authority. Let us see what that authority is. The XXXVth Article recites the subjects of the various homilies *seriatim* (and amongst the others that of the Homily on Repentance), and expressly declares that they 'contain a godly and wholesome doctrine.' Now no doubt this is consistent with saying that there may be expressions not relating to the topic on which a homily professes to treat, *obiter dicta*, so to speak, which may not be authoritative; and that there may be particular arguments not indispensable for supporting the conclusions which may not be of the same force as the conclusions themselves. But can the Article, at the lowest, mean less than to give its sanction to the main doctrine of the homilies in relation to the subjects on which they profess to be written? And it is the main doctrine of the Homily on Repentance on which we rely. Take away that doctrine and the homily would have no meaning.

But there is another Article calling for notice. The XXVth treats of the sacraments. It speaks of two as ordained by

 Christ

Christ in the Gospel, and of five 'commonly called sacraments,' viz., confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, which 'are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scripture.' This phraseology is not of itself distinct enough to prove whether 'penance' is, or is not, a corrupt following; but all doubt is removed by what we find elsewhere. In the Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments is a passage which is almost an echo of that just cited. It mentions baptism and the Lord's Supper, and then enumerates 'other rites and ceremonies' which are 'retained by the order of the Church of England besides these two.' The list comprises the five mentioned by the Article, with *the exception* of penance and extreme unction. It follows, therefore, that these are not 'retained,' and we gather at once that the words 'corrupt following' in the Article are meant to apply to them.

We have thus pursued our investigation through one formulary after another, and have obtained consistent and harmonious results. These results are not to be disposed of by the mere citation of a sentence out of the Service for Ordination of Priests, or by quoting the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. The former of these is simply an application of a text out of the Gospel of St. John, without any comment whatever. And be the meaning of that text what it may, there is nothing in the words themselves or in the context to show that the authority there given was intended to be used in connexion with auricular confession.* The grounds for such an inference must be sought *aliunde.* In the case of the sick, absolution is no doubt given after special confession—in the morning and evening service it is given after public and general confession, and there is nothing to show that the one is of superior efficacy to the other.† The absolution for the sick has indeed given rise to much controversy. But into that controversy we need not enter, for it lies beyond

* 'When we consecrate priests, we pronounce Christ's words over them: "Whose sins you do forgive they are forgiven." But are sins forgiven only by private confession? If so, how happened it then that there was no private confession used in the Church of Constantinople during the whole time that St. Chrysostom was bishop there?'—Jewel, 'Defence of Apology,' Park. Soc. Edit., p. 352. Neither in Matt. xviii. 18, nor in 2 Cor. ii. 10, is confession at all in question.

† Hooker puts them on a par in a passage which should by all means be consulted, and which states the limits within which the Church recognises the 'opening transgressions unto men' ('Eccles. Pol.,' Book VI. chap. iv. 15). Archdeacon Freeman ('Principles of Divine Service,' vol. i. p. 315) says that the form given by our Reformers to the confession and absolution in the morning and evening prayer, is 'that which would most completely adapt them for superseding, in all ordinary cases, private confession and absolution.'

the

the strict limits of our subject. The only use that can fairly be made of that absolution by our opponents in relation to our present topic, is to urge that if it really bear the high interpretation which they assign to it, an inference may seem to arise that an ordinance so precious ought to be availed of as widely as possible. But this is only an inference, and as such cannot counteract the plain sense of other formularies which we have been considering. Least of all can it be allowed to contravene the spirit of the rubric directing the use of that very absolution from which the inference is drawn. That rubric is conditional and points to a special case. It is consequently at variance with any theory which would require the use to be habitual and general. Hence the inference fails, and the only further remark to be made seems to be that if it be a *necessary* inference from what are called high views of absolution, some grave doubt may thence arise whether such views are conformable to the spirit of the Prayer Book.*

From the Prayer Book we turn for a moment to the Canons. The 113th Canon of 1604, after directing ministers to prevent such enormities as are apparent in the parish, adds by way of proviso, 'that if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the minister for the unburdening of his conscience and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him,' the minister is not to reveal them. This, it is said, 'is a direct proof of the common practice of confession and absolution at that period.' To us it seems quite the other way. No statement in relation to a general practice would be ushered in by such hypothetical words. Take an instance: The 18th Canon says, 'No man shall cover his head in the church.' Try for a moment the effect of turning this into, 'If any man come to church he shall cover his head.' The incongruity is palpable. But further, the whole tone of the canons is alien from the

* In point of fact, wherever such views are held, however much the voluntary character of confession may be in terms admitted, there is always a perceptible bias against leaving it really and *bonâ fide* optional. This is a strong indication that the two things are hard to reconcile. As to absolution, Jeremy Taylor puts the dilemma clearly enough. 'The case in short is this: either the sinner hath repented worthily, or he hath not. If he hath, then God hath pardoned him already by virtue of all the promises evangelical. If he hath not repented worthily, the priest cannot, ought not to absolve him: and therefore can by this absolution effect no new thing.'—'Unum Necessarium,' chap. x. § 4. The Bishop of Peterborough in his powerful sermon on 'The Throne of Grace and the Confessional,' cites a distinct statement of the Romish view from Bellarmine: 'Si non essent sacerdotes judices ac vere peccata remitterent, nemo periret in eo solum quòd sacerdotem reconciliantem habere non posset.' May we not fairly argue in like manner, that as with us confession is optional so that no man can be thought to perish simply from not having it, it cannot be that the minister really remits sins?

Ritualist

Ritualist view, for the benefit to be received is, not remission of sin, but consolation and ease of mind. And as if to put beyond doubt the animus of their framers, we find that Canon 67 directs ministers to visit the sick, 'to instruct and comfort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no preacher; or if he be a preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient,' without one word in this latter case to secure that confession should at all events be used. Is it likely that if confession of all remembered sins were a duty of general obligation, some care would not have been taken for its due performance? But no: all that is said is that the minister is to 'instruct and comfort.' In point of fact then the spirit of Canon 113 is merely to impose silence on ministers in respect of what is confided to them in their pastoral communications with their people—such confidences being obviously considered as occasional, not general.

Up to this point we have been considering whether confession should be habitual or exceptional, but it is time to look more fully into the question, What *is* this confession which is thus urged upon us by the Ritualist school?

Before the Reformation it was a fixed dogma that confession must be complete, *i.e.*, that at all events no mortal sin must be omitted which the penitent could remember. And this rested on the ground that pardon could not be had otherwise. Thus Harding, arguing with Jewel, lays down the doctrine:—

> 'That the recital and rehearsal of all sins before the priest is necessary to salvation, unless necessity for lack of a priest or otherwise, exclude us from it, and that a general confession in no wise sufficeth.'*

But this, as we have seen, is no longer the doctrine of our Church. Confession is optional, not necessary to salvation, and hence, the reason of the rule having ceased, we infer that the rule has ceased also. But we have more than inference, as we proceed to show.

Our service for the Visitation of the Sick was mainly taken from one previously in use, which is to be found in the Sarum Manual; but on a comparison of the two we find striking variations, and these are precisely such as bear upon the point now before us. In the Sarum Office,† the priest makes a very solemn address to the sick man as to the necessity of confessing all his sins. He exhorts him to the most careful self-examination in order that he may recall every transgression with all its aggravating circumstances, and enjoins him to confess all such *ab initio*, lest per-

* 3 Jew., Park. Soc. Edit., p. 369.

† Maskell's 'Monumenta Ritualia,' vol. i. p. 66.

chance

chance in former confessions he should have concealed or suppressed anything. For the better performance of this, the priest is to assist him with interrogations, and at the conclusion is authorised to give only the following carefully limited form of absolution: 'I absolve thee from all these sins for which thou hast felt hearty contrition, and which thou hast with thy mouth confessed to me, and from all other thy sins which, if they had come to thy memory, thou would'st willingly have confessed.'

In our own service, no address as to the necessity of complete confession is found, and the absolution is unlimited—'from all thy sins.' These variations are significant enough, and are in harmony with what we read in the homily, that no man is to be bound to the numbering of his sins. Confession, or the 'opening of grief,' as recognised in our Church, is not to be confounded with the exhaustive medieval system. It is rather identical with the 'showing of the trouble and doubt of the conscience to the pastor'—a thing expressly distinguished by the homily from the system in the times of blindness and ignorance.*

Having thus ascertained the theory of the Church of England, let us now contrast with it the practice of her Ritualist members. One of the works before us says:—

'Confession, that true confession to which alone absolution is pronounced or can be given, must be, so far as it is possible to make it, an actual fore-stalling of the Judgment, in obedience to that command of the Church, which says "Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord."† The one solemn and earnest effort of the penitent, must be to detail every sin of thought, word, or deed, which he can ever remember to have committed, as fully, unreservedly, and strictly, as they will be declared in the ears of all men at the awful Judgment Day, and with that same perfect freedom from all palliation,' &c.‡

Again:—

'In truth it were utterly impossible for the Priest to give Absolution unless he had a perfect knowledge of all the sins that burden the conscience of the penitent.§ It were simply an unreal mockery to

* It has, indeed, been urged, that because at the last Review the words 'of his sins' were added after the word 'confession' in the visitation rubric, *all* sins must be confessed. The short answer is, If the rubric *meant all* sins, why did it not *say* so, as the Sarum Office does? The words probably mean that the confession should take in sins against God, as well as any other 'weighty matter' troubling the mind; which nobody denies. 'Expressio eorum quæ tacite insunt (says the legal maxim) nihil operatur.'

† We really think none but a Ritualist would take an exhortation to judge ourselves, as a command to submit to the judgment of another.

‡ 'Ministry of Consolation,' p. 29.

§ This is in close harmony with the Council of Trent. See Sess. XIV., c. 5.

say

say "I absolve thee from *all* thy sins," when he knows not whether they be such as can be absolved, or whether the penitence of the sinner be such as to render the absolution indeed efficacious. The fact that there is at least *one* sin which has never forgiveness, neither in this world, neither in that which is to come, renders it absolutely essential, that the priest should be in a condition to know of a surety that he is not involuntarily taking the name of God in vain, by pronouncing in Christ's stead the pardon of some iniquity which that same Lord has willed never to pardon—thus declaring "Peace, peace, where there is no peace." Power is given to the priest not only to remit, but to retain—to bind as well as to loose—and he may not dare to exercise the absolving portion of this twofold authority without possessing an absolute certainty that there is nought in the penitent's condition to compel him to use that other and more awful function.'*

This remarkable passage will not be lost on the reader. In the earlier part of it there seems to be a claim to the knowledge of that sin which we had hitherto supposed all schools of theologians agreed in considering as one of the hidden things of scripture. But we can hardly wonder at any amount of knowledge being claimed for those who seem to possess the privilege of reading men's hearts, since they arrive at 'an absolute certainty' of the condition of their penitents.

Accordingly, the preparation for a first confession, especially when the party is an adult who has never confessed before, is a discipline of no ordinary severity. Full instructions for it are given in more than one of the works before us. Thus in Mr. Gresley's work:—

'To facilitate this search into your whole past life, it is best to divide your life into periods, according to any outward changes, *e. gr.* of first going to school (if you ever were at one) or of abode, or any marked events of life which make certain stages in it, or any turning points either for good or evil. Then in each throw yourself back as much as you can into your former life, thinking with whom you lived, acted, conversed, were intimate; how you employed, amused yourself, your conduct as to church, &c. Try to bring everything before you: each separate scene in every place,—the fields, or streets, or houses around your home or abode; your walks, rides, society, loneliness and lonely thoughts; the rooms you lived in, their very furniture,—everything helps to recover the memory of your past life, and so bring back (alas!) the memory of some sin.† As you recall them, you had better mark them down for yourself, by some abbreviations which others cannot understand, else you might forget them. In any

* Ministry of Consolation,' p. 32. See also 'Repentance,' p. 61, and 'Little Prayer Book,' p. 31. It is fair to add that Mr. Carter ('Doct. of Conf.') takes a somewhat less extreme view.

† Quære, Are all these past sins supposed up to that time to be unforgiven?

heavier

heavier sin it is best to trace out the beginnings or forerunners of it (it is, alas! commonly something in childhood) then, when it began to be more against conscience, the length of time it lasted, any aggravations of it, how it ramified into other sins, or in what different forms it appeared; or if it were one in act as well as thought and word; or if it were a sin of the senses, what different senses were engaged in it —as the sight, hearing, touch: whether,' &c.—'Ordinance of Confession,' p. 69.

Then we come to 'some estimate of the frequency.' Then under 'habitual sins,' the direction is:—

'Look as closely as you can into your past life, year by year, month by month, and week by week. People have been able to recall that such or such a deadly sin was committed, at times twice in the week or even daily. Make such an average, as nearly as you can, for each year; take account of the periods, longer or shorter, during which you were free,' &c.

Then the whole life is to be examined in relation to the Commandments—then with relation to the means of grace, &c. It is natural, therefore, that the author of the 'Ministry of Consolation' should recommend that written memoranda should be made for the confession which is to follow:—

'Were you to trust to your unassisted recollection it could scarce fail but that amid your trembling and your shame, the failing of your heart and struggling of your soul, you would be distracted with a thousand fears, that half the sins you had desired to tell were now forgotten, and in the effort to recall them, you would pass from confusion to bewilderment, till haply in your fear of sacrilege by incomplete confession you come to dread the very absolution which should be your chiefest joy.'—p. 87.

After this, it can excite no surprise to hear that three weeks or a month, during which the mind is as far as possible to be abstracted from all worldly thoughts and cares, is the period suggested for the preparation in question,* or that the authoress of 'Thirty Years in the English Church' spent nearly six hours on two successive days kneeling at the altar rail, when she made her first confession.† Owing to ignorance she had made, it appears, an imperfect preparation, though she seems to have occupied a month in the work. And this terrific ordeal is what is gravely put forward as the medicine for an anxious and scrupulous conscience!

But the question here suggests itself, How is such complete confession to be attained, and by what interrogations is it to

* 'Ministry of Consolation,' p. 85.
† 'Church and the World,' 1st series, p. 225.

be

be assisted or extorted? We find (as might be expected) that instructions are given to 'the priest' on this subject, and that they are rapidly maturing into a regular system, resembling in the closest manner that of the Church of Rome. 'The Priest in Absolution' is a manual for this amongst other objects, and contains 'Hints for the Priest in examining the Penitent.' Thus it it is laid down that—

'Should he [the penitent] deny sins of thought [on the subject of chastity] he should not be questioned about acts, unless he be perchance very uninstructed; for persons often do not realise that thoughts are sins, at any rate unless they willed to proceed to acts; whence ordinarily such ought to be questioned about works, then about words, and lastly about thoughts. If the penitent confess wilful thoughts, he should be questioned about conversations, looks, touch; if he confess these, he should be questioned whether perchance anything worse has been committed, or at any rate lusted after, or willed to be committed, if shame or fear had not held him back; for some are so uninstructed that except they be thus questioned they remain silent, thinking it enough to give the Priest an opportunity of questioning them by dropping hints. Finally, the nature and number of sins should be asked.'—p. 23.*

The words which next follow contain a general caution against over-minuteness of inquiry: and this (strange to say) is exemplified by hints as to the style of interrogation to be used towards 'married persons,' which are such as we dare not transfer to these pages. Yet these are given as an instance of cautious and

* It must be borne in mind by our readers that this extreme minuteness is not matter of discretion, but of necessity, on the theory now before us, in order to enable the priest to apportion the penance correctly, and to discover whether the penitent has committed 'mortal' or 'venial' sin—a question which lets in the nicest distinctions of casuistry. In fact, if the practice of inculcating the need of absolution for every mortal sin, and the consequent necessity of full confessions, be once admitted, the whole system of the Romish confessional must inevitably follow. Thus the work before us says that the priest must '(1) be able to distinguish between sins unto death and sins not unto death; between what in the nature of sin is grievous, and what is comparatively trivial, so as not to confound one with the other. He must (2) be acquainted with the principles upon which he has to decide how far the particular sin is tinged by the circumstances of the case, so as to remove it from one class to the other.'—p. 7. This is precisely the medieval system; and in order to show to what it led before the Reformation, and must lead, we apprehend, wherever the principle is carried out, we venture to cite from our old English canonist Lyndwood an example of such distinctions as are here hinted at. It is happily shrouded in a learned language. He lays it down in relation to this very subject of confession that Thomas Aquinas says that, 'Quando quis propter voluptatem et delectationem commiscetur conjugi, ita tamen quòd illa voluptas consistat infra limites matrimonii, viz., quòd cum aliâ muliere hoc non faceret, tunc est veniale peccatum. Si autem delectationem quærat in eâ ut in meretrice, exercendo suum affectum extra fines matrimonii, ita, scilicet, quòd si non esset uxor tamen idem faceret, tunc est mortale peccatum.'—*Lyndwood*, Lib. v., tit. 16, p. 343.

modest

modest questioning. It may, doubtless, be possible to find in the lowest depth a lower still; but we almost wonder what it is supposed that an over-zealous priest would have been in danger of proceeding to ask if not thus cautioned. As we cannot possibly discuss the subject here, we content ourselves with respectfully directing the attention of the Bishops to the whole work to which we refer.

Another question arises for consideration, viz.: Is there anything to authorise a clergyman to impose a penance upon a penitent?

A penance, be it understood, is not mere counsel or advice, but is something which is imposed as a condition of absolution.* In earlier times it must have been performed before absolution could be given; but in the present system of the Church of Rome, absolution is received upon confession; but the penitent must accept the penance enjoined, and have the intention of performing it, otherwise the absolution will be withheld, or will be void if given.†

If we ask what is the object of penance, we are told by the Doctors of Rome that it is a punishment voluntarily submitted to, in order to make compensation for the injury done to God by the sin of the penitent.‡ It must not merely be by way of medicine for the future spiritual life, but as vengeance and punishment for the past sin.§ Accordingly the priest is bound to enjoin some penance, and must not omit it.‖ In precise accordance with this, we are told by the author of 'The Priest in Absolution' (p. 40), that—

'The priest must impose some act of penitence on the penitent, greater or less in proportion to the sins confessed; since he ought, as judge, to obtain some reparation for the injured party.'

Strange as this language may appear, its harmony with the expressions of the scholastic theology leaves no doubt in our minds that the 'injured party,' whose claim to reparation the priest takes upon him to estimate and assess, is the Deity—an

* The distinction seems quite recognised in the works before us. See 'Repentance,' pp. 63 and 150.

† See Dens, 'Theol. Mor. et Dogm.,' vol. vi. p. 244; and ibid. vol vi. p. 14.

‡ See ibid. vol. vi. p. 243. Aquinas even says that mere good works, unless such as to be painful to the penitent, are not a proper satisfaction. 'Summ. Theol.,' Part III. Supplem. Quæst. 15, Art. I.

§ See Council of Trent, Sess. XIV. cap. 8 prope finem. It will be remembered that our homily speaks of the true satisfaction being a new life, thus contradicting in terms the Tridentine view.

‖ Dens, vol. vi. p. 243.

idea

idea on which we forbear to comment. And Mr. Wagner when before the Ritual Commission said :—

'Whenever a person makes a confession, of course there is always some penance enjoined; it may be saying a prayer. It usually would be saying some one or two prayers. It would be one's duty to impose some penance or other.'—Report, p. 114.

Mr. Wagner, indeed, does not explain why he conceived this to be such an indispensable duty, but it is difficult to avoid supposing that it was on a like ground.

We are aware that penances are thought useful on other grounds, as to testify the sincerity of repentance, or for the purpose of self-mortification; but we are not aware that such reasons would make them indispensable. In the nature of things it is hardly likely that *every* penitent would need them for such purposes. And, in fact, a writer who advocates penance only on these grounds, contemplates the possibility that it would not always be enjoined.* We fear, therefore, that Mr. Wagner, and the author of 'The Priest in Absolution' must be considered to go further, and to approximate to the Roman view.

But, be this as it may, we proceed to the broad question whether there is anything to empower a clergyman of the Church of England to impose, either habitually or occasionally, anything in the nature of a penance as a condition of absolution. We have yet to learn that there is. Neither in the authoritative documents of the Church, nor in the works of those who framed them, is there, so far as we are aware, any sanction to be found for any other penance than that enjoined by an Ecclesiastical Judge *in foro externo*, as a branch of Church discipline.†

That the Reformers wished public Church discipline for open sins to be restored and extended, there are many passages to show. But, as the Bishop of Killaloe has observed, even in the Commination Service :—

'an office expressly substituted for the godly discipline of the ancient Church . . . . there is not a word said, not a hint dropped of any auricular confession put in place of the old exomologesis, not a syllable of any "private discipline" in place of the old godly and public one.' ‡

The case then stands thus. At the time of the Reformation

* 'Ministry of Consolation,' p. 164.

† This, as every one who has studied the subject is aware, belongs to an entirely different category. In the theology of the Church of Rome it is not sacramental penance at all.

‡ 'Charge to the Clergy,' 1867, p. 59. Comp. Marshall's 'Penitent. Disc.' p. 143, Anglo. Cath. Library Edit.

there

there was a well-settled system of penance, grounded mainly upon the doctrine of 'satisfaction' as laid down by the Church of Rome. This basis is taken away by the rejection of that doctrine by the Reformers, and therefore the question is, On what does the authority rest to impose private penances at all? If the Church intended to drop the imposition of penance, along with the doctrine on which it mainly rested, it is natural enough that no further mention of it should be found. But if it were meant not to discontinue, but to remodel the system, surely it is strange that no directions, no details, no distinct allusion to the subject is to be found. In the Church of Rome confessors follow a sort of customary system,* tolerably well understood, though not actually laid down in any written code. In England up to the Reformation there were certain Episcopal constitutions, and there was the Penitential of Archbishop Theodore. But all these systems were the offshoot of, and grew out of, the doctrine of 'satisfaction,' and cannot legitimately be applied to a system having different objects. Moreover, they are so onerous that they are not now, and probably never were, honestly carried out, but have always been modified (if we should not rather say nullified) by the allowance of dispensations, and various kinds of commutations.† By what rule, then, is it contended that penances are to be imposed, or are they to be practically without rule, and at the absolute discretion of the confessor?‡ This is not only an important, but rather an alarming question, when we read of the passive obedience which the tenets of Ritualism demand from penitents.

'The obedience which alone befits the humble soul in spiritual relations must be free and unquestioning, preventing, with a settled purpose of submission, every command which the judgment of the priest may see fit to lay upon us. We say not that this obedience must of necessity extend to all the occurrences and trials of our existence. No spiritual father would wish to hedge us in too much, even with the deep blessing of his care, for doubtless our strength could not be tested without due liberty of action; but we must leave it to him to settle the boundaries of our freedom, for in confession it scarce can fail but we should touch on all the springs and influences of our inner life, and for everything therein made known, our sins, temptations, trials, and dangers, in all

* The ancient penitential canons have long been laid aside in practice.

† See a ludicrous permission for doing penance by deputy in Johnson's 'Canons,' sub anno 963.

‡ In the Church of Rome the priest in the tribunal of penitence appears to be irresponsible save to God. The only remedy faintly suggested for an excessive exercise of his power is that the penitent may, perhaps, be permitted to resort to another confessor in the hope that he may be disposed to mitigate the sentence. (Dens, 'Theol. Mor. et Dogm.' vol. vi. p. 256. Edit. 1832.) Even this refuge is sternly refused by Ritualist doctors.—See 'Priest in Absolution,' p. 47.

their

their bearings, we are bound to submit ourselves to the remedies and preventions prescribed, whatsoever they may be. Possibly in these very revelations he may see it good for us to leave us much liberty; but whether he so deal with us, or rather find it needful to bind our rebel passions and our wayward hearts in chains, and whether in the abstract some might differ from his mode of government, it suffices for the penitent that he is the ambassador of Christ to him, and he must accept his words as from the Lord. For how speaks the Holy Ghost? "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." . . . "The same law of implicit obedience is binding on the penitent in confession under all circumstances." '*

But is it really true that there is no indication of the mind of the Church of England adverse to the stupendous scheme of sacerdotal authority to which these extracts point? We think it tolerably plain that such indications exist for those who are disposed to look for them. Something might be said upon the wording of the Exhortation to which we have so often referred in the Communion Service.† But instead of dwelling on this, let us look again at the Sarum Office. The priest is there directed to inform the sick person of the penance due to the sins which he has confessed, to inform him that under the circumstances it will not be imposed, and to enjoin upon him a special almsgiving or benefaction (to be defined by the priest) in lieu thereof. At the same time he is to warn him that, if he should recover, the penance must still be performed.

Now the question once more is, why was all this left out of our present Prayer Book? Is not the conclusion irresistible that our Reformers went through the previous forms with care, and grounded the new services in a great degree upon them, but purged them of what was inconsistent with the spirit of the Reformed Church?

But this is not all. Our reformed rubric says:—

'Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. *After which confession* the priest *shall* absolve him (*if he humbly and heartily desire it*), after this sort,' &c.

---

* 'Ministry of Consolation,' p. 65.

† Mr. Carter, who often writes with much candour, speaking of this Exhortation, thinks that one of the changes probably intended to be effected by the language there used, as compared with the medieval practice, was 'the restricting the objects of confession to absolution and spiritual counsel; no mention being made of satisfaction, or compensation for the temporal penalties of sin, which had formed so material a part of the medieval idea of penance.'—p. 106. Yet in the little work called 'Repentance,' of which Mr. Carter is the editor, distinct reference is made to penance, and the penitent is directed to ask the confessor to impose it.—See pp. 63 and 150.

The

The direction to absolve is imperative, and but one condition is laid down which has reference exclusively to the desires and state of mind of the penitent as then evidenced, not to any future acts to be done by him. 'Expressio unius est exclusio alterius,' the naming of one condition excludes others not named.* Advice may be given, but we apprehend no penance can be imposed as a condition of absolution.

But the sense of a law is sometimes to be collected from the way in which it has been understood in practice. To this test Ritualists (strange to say) venture to appeal. They say that in the proceedings for restoring the old system on the accession of Mary, no mention is made of confession, as though no change had been made in this respect in the time of Edward VI., and no restoration was needed. The simple answer is that the assertion is not well-founded. The Convocation of 1557 specially directed that sermons should be preached 'de eucharistiâ, *de pœnitentiâ, de confessione auriculari*, et de reliquis sacramentis, *quæ heretici nostri temporis maxime impugnarunt*' (Card. Synod. 2, p. 452). What could they have said more to the point?

But, further, the Ritualist writers have drawn out a very elaborate catena of divines, who they assert are on their side on this question of confession. The process by which it has been constructed is of the simplest kind. Every writer who names the word confession with anything like toleration is at once set down in the list, though the meaning which he attached to the word may be wholly different from that contended for by those who profess to rely on his authority. The result is that the word being used in one sense in the premises and in another in the conclusion, very striking instances are produced of the fallacy known to logicians as that of the ambiguous middle term.

Thus, Mr. Gresley quotes Latimer as saying, 'But to speak of right and true confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing. And those which find themselves grieved in conscience might goe to a learned man, and there fetch of him comfort of the Word of God,' &c. The reader will take notice that the system advocated by Mr. Gresley himself is that—

'If other sins come back to your mind afterwards, which you would have confessed had you remembered them, they should be confessed afterwards, because the forgiveness is conditional upon the completeness of the confession.'—'Ordinance of Confession,' p. 77.

---

* Restitution for wrong done to man has been dealt with in a previous rubric. Of this, of course, we are not now speaking.

Is

Is this Latimer's doctrine? Those who refer to his works will find that the words which immediately precede those quoted run as follows:—

'Here our papists make ado with their auricular confession, proving the same by this place [viz. the healing of the leper]. For they say, Christ sent this man unto the priest to fetch there his absolution; and therefore we must go also unto the priest, and, after confession, receive of him absolution of all our sins. But yet we must take heed, say they, that we forget nothing; for all those sins that are forgotten may not be forgiven. And so they bind the consciences of men, persuading them that when their sins were all numbered and confessed, it was well. And hereby they took clean away the passion of Christ. For they made this numbering of sins to be a merit,' &c.—'Sermons and Remains of Latimer,' Park. Soc., p. 179.

It is in direct contrast to this that he speaks of 'right and true confession.'

Sometimes by a strange error, an opinion is cited which the author himself subsequently changed. Thus Mr. Carter cites the Reformer Becon as in favour of auricular confession, but he has omitted to observe that 'The Potation for Lent,' from which he quotes, was written in the reign of Henry VIII. and during the time that auricular confession was enforced under pain of felony by the famous statute of the Six Articles.* If, therefore, it speaks Becon's real mind at all, it contains at most his earliest sentiments, and such as he would not subsequently have expressed. In his later works he speaks quite otherwise, and rejoices that the realm is delivered from Antichrist's tyranny, and that his 'earish confession' is 'banished out of the land.' † Still more strange is the mistake of Mr. J. D. Chambers, who, after citing the 'Potation for Lent,' says that Becon 'repeats the same in his treatise called the "Castle of Comfort."' The fact turns out to be that the 'Castle of Comfort' is one of Becon's later works, and that the whole passage is there completely modified in order to harmonise with the *then* opinions of the writer, which are that absolution and the power of the keys mean *the preaching of the Gospel!* ‡

Occasionally the authority of a writer is claimed for sentiments the exact contrary of those which he really holds. The Rev. J. C. Chambers cites the 'honoured names' of Hooker and

---

* The statute is distinctly referred to in the treatise (Becon's 'Early Writings,' Parker Edit., p. 102), and the treatise itself is denounced by name in a proclamation of Henry VIII. See Foxe's 'Martyrs,' vol. v. p. 566. Cattley's Edition. Its date is therefore fixed conclusively.

† 3 Becon (Parker Soc. Edit.), p. 4; and see also p. 233.

‡ 2 Becon (Parker Soc. Edit.), p. 366.

Taylor

Taylor as authorities for maintaining 'the principle of sacramental confession.' * The fact is that Hooker expressly speaks of 'the sacrament of repentance' as 'invented' by Rome,† and Jeremy Taylor, as far as we have been able to find, never uses the word 'sacramental' in connexion with the subject except when he is stating the views of his opponents.‡

But we forbear, for we must draw to a conclusion.§ We have probably said enough to show that in such 'catenæ' the links must be weighed and proved as well as numbered. But were it otherwise, and were the percentage of genuine testimony larger than it is, it would be of little avail. All that is ever likely to be shown is that a comparatively small number of divines have, in indefinitely various degrees, and in indefinitely various senses, spoken favourably of confession.

Those who have put it forward at all strongly are exceptions rather than otherwise, even in such a list. No such general concurrence, still less such uniform or common practice, can be exhibited, as would alone be admissible in order to construe even a doubtful enactment. Still less can it override laws that are unambiguous. And regarded in themselves as the mere opinions of divines, we must decline to be absolutely bound by such authorities, however venerable. We must say with the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, in a like case :—

'The question is not to be decided by a reference to the opinions, however respectable, of individuals eminent for their learning, or distinguished by their station in the Church.' ‖

Opinions equally strong might be cited on the other side and an interminable discussion would thus arise. It is to the authoritative documents of the Church that appeal must be made, though we may fairly consult the works of Divines for counsel and advice.

And now, having finished our task, we shall probably be met by an exulting cry, 'After all you have failed to prove that the Church of England forbids confession.' Certainly we have not

* 'Church and the World,' 2nd series, p. 227.

† 'Eccles. Polity,' Book VI., chap. vi. 13.

‡ In language more severe than we should have ventured to use, but the justice of which we are not disposed to dispute, the Bishop of Killaloe says (in his able charge for this year), 'The manner in which Bishop Taylor's sentiments on the Real Presence and on priestly absolution have been misrepresented by carefully garbled quotations, is one of the most disgraceful phenomena of modern controversy,' p. 28. He is speaking of Ritualist writers in general.

§ The reader will find the opinions of the Reformers, as well as the general subject, ably discussed in 'An Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Church of England on Private Confession and Absolution,' by C. J. Elliott, M.A. Rivingtons, 1859.

‖ Brod. and Frem., p. 26.

 proved

proved that which we never asserted. Confession—in the sense of unreserved pastoral intercourse between the learned minister of God's Word and the souls that in some 'spiritual emergencies' have failed to obtain peace by the appointed means of secret prayer and repentance—is assuredly not forbidden; who could wish for its prohibition?

But confession, as the result of a teaching, which first disquiets the conscience by enhancing the difficulty of pardon for post-baptismal sin, and then makes the disquiet which it has itself created the justification for a discipline of penance carried on under rules derived from mediæval casuistry and tending to a sacerdotal despotism—and which makes all this not occasional, but habitual; not optional, but binding on the conscience; not expedient for some men, but the duty of all—such confession has no place in the formularies of the Church, and is unknown to her recorded history. Writers of a scholastic intellect and an ascetic temper may have dropped hints or maintained paradoxes here and there which the ingenuity of controversy may array on the side of such a theory. But the discretion which the Church has, within certain limits, entrusted to her pastors in such matters, has hitherto been used, on the whole, with wisdom and moderation. At all events it has not yet been generally abused for the erection of a system at variance with the spirit of the Reformation. That some such discretion should exist was unavoidable. It was not possible wholly to forbid what in certain aspects was not without utility. But to make its existence a pretext for its abuse, to turn the exception into the rule and the occasional remedy into the constant habit, resembles the conduct of one, who because some powerful medicine is sanctioned by high authority as a cure for certain diseases, should claim such authority as on his side in mixing it day by day with the food of his children. We know the result: certain distempers would perhaps be obviated, but worse would be engendered. Above all, an artificial life would be set up, and the tone of the constitution altogether broken down. And all this, not from the employment of a forbidden medicine, but from the undue use of one that was allowable. Still more injurious and unauthorised must it be, not merely to make an excessive use of the kind of confession sanctioned by the Church, but under that term to introduce a practice, which (as we venture to think) differs from it in spirit and intention, though it agrees with it in name.

Here, then, we pause. To go further would answer no useful purpose. For, in point of fact, those with whom we are now arguing would most of them be the last in the world to submit

to

to the judgment of the divines whom Englishmen have been accustomed to look upon as the Fathers of the Reformed Church. Advanced Ritualists may strive to avail themselves of the names of Latimer, Cranmer, Becon and others, as an *argumentum ad hominem* likely to tell with their opponents, but they allow no weight to them themselves. In a recent number of their weekly organ appeared an article headed 'Our Martyrs,' of which the following formed part:—

'Regarding the signification of the term "Martyr" from a religious point of view, it might fairly be contended that it is far too glorious a one to attach to men of such characters as history represents the Reformers to have been; and further, we might assert that martyrdom proper can only be endured in support of what is unquestionably God's truth, and that those who suffered in the reign of Mary failed, on the testimony of their own writings, to fulfil this requirement.' *

After this, no one will wonder to hear that the same paper, in another article, describes 'the controversy between England and Rome on the subject of the Real Presence' as 'a foolish and therefore a wicked logomachy,' and insists that the two Churches in reality hold 'the same doctrine.' And it proceeds to recommend a work just published under 'the appropriate title of "The Kiss of Peace,"' as 'a masterly demonstration of this great truth.'

We have now done. We shall not have written in vain if we have in any measure succeeded in calling attention to the fact that the Ritualist party cannot rightly be treated as if it had but added another to those great schools of religious thought, which, however divergent from each other, have long and happily coexisted in the bosom of the Reformed Church of England. It is a distinct anti-Reformation movement—a systematic attempt to undo the work of the sixteenth century. It remains that all men—the laity no less than the heads of the Church—should take note of this fact, and act as the circumstances may demand.

We have contented ourselves with proving that private confession, as taught and practised by the Ritualists, is opposed alike to the teaching and the spirit of the Church of England. But we should be wanting in our duty if we concluded without warning the Church of the danger to which this party is exposing her dearest interests. Of all the errors of the Church of Rome, that of auricular confession is most hateful to the people of England. A speaker at the recent Church Congress at Wolverhampton, among other unwelcome truths, warned his audience 'that the priestly idea leads to the establishment of another

* 'Church Times,' Nov. 2, 1867.

master in every household, by every hearth, in the place of the husband and the father.' And we feel sure that the great mass of the English people would be for ever alienated from the Church, if they found the priest extracting from their wives their most secret thoughts, from their sons what they dared not tell their fathers, and from their daughters what they would blush to confess to their mothers.

ART. IV.—*Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de mon Temps.* Par M. Guizot. Tome Huitième. Paris, 1867.

WE happened, not long since, to make the acquaintance of a gentleman very familiar with the spiritual world, who told us many interesting particulars of that world of table-rappers and table-turners. According to his account, the transition from this existence to that into which we pass on being put into our coffins is by no means one of extreme contrast. We still retain many of our substantial tastes and propensities, and inhabit the mansions (though impalpable and unperceivable), if they are to our fancy, which we formerly inhabited, stroll through the gardens of which we loved and cultivated the flowers, and are in constant intercourse with that small number of friends who still feel any interest in our acquaintance. But that which we learnt with peculiar satisfaction was, that whilst our shadow retains amongst other shadows its old semblance, we always wear our best looks and our best clothes. There has appeared among French statesmen of late a great disposition to anticipate this excellent regulation, and we find them struggling with evident pains to put on their best looks and clothes on this side of the grave, instead of waiting till they get to the other.

There is a celebrated picture by Murillo of the Canon le Bonaventura, who is represented as having risen from his tomb and writing his memoirs. It is, perhaps, from this picture, formerly in Louis Philippe's collection, that M. de Chateaubriand took the idea of 'Mémoires d'Outre Tombe.' But neither M. de Chateaubriand, nor others who have followed his, have taken the trouble of dying in order to imitate the Canon. They have written *soit disant* from their graves, whilst sitting by a blazing fire or a sunny bow-window, anticipating a good appetite for their evening repast.

We shall say nothing to discourage a habit from which much instruction as well as amusement is derived. We like to read the writings of men of action; there is a reality about them which

which mere men of letters rarely give to their productions. Autobiographers, it is true, are never impartial: they make themselves several inches taller and many degrees comelier than they ever were; but we know this and discount it. Besides, there is one thing about them which we learn better from their self-eulogy than we could from the criticisms of their antagonists. No rule is so certain as that 'a man is never that which he strives most to appear.' We shall recur to this maxim in a subsequent portion of this article. What we shall first attempt is to give some notion of M. Guizot's general career, and of M. Guizot himself, who will always be an historical personage, whatever part may be assigned to him in history.

The epoch at which M. Guizot came into the world was that in which ideas took a new birth amidst the visions of philosophers, whose amiable dreams were interrupted by the shout of the 'Ça ira' and the stroke of the guillotine. He was born at Nismes, in 1787, of an old Protestant family in that town. His father was one of the most eminent advocates of the province. Having stood up against the excesses of the Jacobins, he was proscribed by them and brought to the scaffold in 1794. His widow took refuge in Geneva, at the gymnasium of which city Francis Guizot was educated in that union of the classic, French, and German literature which gave a wide basis to the learning of the scholar. At home he was 'reared in very liberal sentiments, but also in austere habits and pious belief.' He entered the world of Paris in 1807, and first essayed his pen in the periodical of M. Suard, defending the 'martyrs' of Chateaubriand from the attacks which were as extreme on the part of one set of critics as the eulogies were on the part of another. At the fall of Napoleon, M. de Fontanes, Napoleon's Grand Master of the University, who did not fall with his master, was charged by the Restoration with the task of selecting and encouraging the studious youth who were to illustrate the literature of the Restoration. Villemain and Guizot were his disciples, Royer Collard his friend. It was the latter who procured the nomination of M. Guizot to the post of Secretary to the Ministry of the Interior at the commencement of the reign of Louis XVIII.

Such was the consideration the young Secretary almost immediately acquired that, during the hundred days, he was sent by the constitutionalists at Paris to the sovereign they still recognised at Ghent, to advise the abandonment of M. de Blacas. On Louis XVIII.'s return the youthful aspirant to public honours accepted the position in the Ministry of Instruction which he had previously held in the Ministry of the Interior. Frequent attempts

attempts were made in after times to cast obloquy on him for having been thus employed, but such obloquy was not deserved.

The first Administration of 1815 had constitutional intentions, and might, therefore, be fairly served by men of constitutional principles. When these intentions could not be carried out, M. Guizot forsook the career of the official politician for the chair of the Historical Professor, forming from history a code of politics round which gathered by degrees a clique that could hardly be called a party, who were christened *Doctrinaires*, and who proudly accepted that name. The faults of this clique were the faults which always characterise men of letters who wish to be men of action and are not men of the world. To govern men, you must either excite their fears or their sympathies. Now, the theories of the *Doctrinaires* were all against tyranny, whilst their views of popular government were neither couched in the language nor sustained by the manners which in all times and places captivate the people. These severe-looking gentlemen proposed liberty with the air of a doctor who offers a medicine which he acknowledges to be bitter and disagreeable to the taste, but which he assures you is calculated in the long run to do you an immensity of good.

M. Guizot has himself described the nature and origin of his haughty little band, who aimed at being mediators between Royalists and revolutionists, and thought of dominating the nation by appealing to its intelligence rather than to its habits or its heart. 'There was great pride in the attempt,' writes M. Guizot, 'to communicate to politics a good philosophy.' The pride was natural and undeniable: we do not quarrel with it; but, unfortunately, the great bulk of mankind are not prone to philosophise, and to pretend to guide them as if they were, is more likely to provoke ridicule than reverence. 'It is lucky,' said Rogers, condoling with Moore on a severe infliction, 'that you were a poet. If you had been a philosopher, you could never have stood it.'

The most remarkable feature, however, in the character of the *Doctrinaires* was, that whilst they set up the banner of a middle party and were mild and conciliatory as long as they confined themselves to professions, they became at once violent and extreme directly they entered upon action. Never calculating on the consequences, they swore hostility to any who differed (whether much or little did not matter) from their peculiar ideas: all were to work on a pattern of their drawing, from which there was to be no deviation. Thus, during the Restoration it was they who caused the failure of the two liberal attempts—first,

first, that of Decazes, and secondly, that of Martignac—to advance by degrees towards the true principles of representative government, and brought about the struggle between the King and the nation which it was their especial and avowed object to prevent.

The share however which M. Guizot had had in overturning one monarchy made him a minister in the next. In the mean time the Revolution which produced this change had buoyed up to the surface of society men who in ordinary circumstances would have been at the bottom: and circumspect statesmen saw at once the necessity of humouring and conciliating the masses until such time as their passions had subsided, or until confidence restored to trade brought back the artisan to his daily labour. M. Guizot, on the contrary, was one of the few who allowed themselves to be irritated by a turbulence that was inevitable; he was for instantly putting down with the strong hand that excitement which could only be gradually appeased. The new monarch deemed it wiser to make use of Lafitte's and Lafayette's popularity to tide over the difficult business of the ex-Ministers' trial; and it was not till these not over-sagacious politicians had served his purpose, that he dismissed them as 'men who might save the State in a tempest, but who were certain to wreck it in a calm.' Casimir Perier then took office, and effectually cleared the open street of insurrection. But Casimir Perier, though firm, did not desire to be unnecessarily unpopular, and declined on that account to take M. Guizot into his administration, saying 'this man wishes to give to the movement of government the precise regularity of a machine; and as he has no practical knowledge of the use of the engine he is disposed to direct, will some day get his hand caught in the wheels.'

The year 1832 saw the French Ministry 'of all the talents,' the strongest and best that Louis Philippe ever formed. Soult was President of the Council; the Duke de Broglie, Minister of Foreign Affairs; Guizot, Minister of Public Instruction. Thus the right men were in their right places. M. Guizot was a most admirable education Minister. M. Thiers succeeded in arresting the Duchess of Berry. The Duke de Broglie would listen to no royal crotchets, and as a completion to the efficiency of the Government, Prince Talleyrand represented it in London. Could the King have held such a Cabinet together, or replaced carefully the stones which time shook from the arch, he might have had a happy and prosperous reign. But we can scarcely blame him for not accomplishing this almost impossible task. No two Frenchmen, with anything like equal intellect, can agree on the division of power. MM. Thiers and Guizot could never agree. Each, instead

instead of being contented with the duties attached to any office in the home administration, was anxious to appear on the great stage of foreign affairs. Both thought the task of governing, regenerating, pacifying France too vulgar, too easy, and, above all, too obscure for their ambition. Neither, indeed, penetrated the true mystery of domestic government, the development of the national resources, the satisfying of all just and worthy aspirations. As to internal policy, M. Guizot summed up his ideas in one word—*resistance;* and gave to resistance a harsh and uncompromising form.

M. Thiers had another principle, which was that of 'diversion.' Men's minds were to be turned from liberty to glory, and he was so far right that no government which is not strong and respected abroad has ever been able to maintain freedom without confusion at home. But Louis Philippe did not care at all for glory. What he wanted was to manage everything, and to keep everything quiet. 'All the talents' therefore separated, each star assuming its distinct place in the political firmament. Thiers tried to govern alone for a short time, and took the Foreign Office, but soon came into collision with the King on the question of Spain, concerning which Thiers was for pursuing a frank and decided policy—the King a double and doubtful one. Various ministerial combinations followed, all proving the two facts to which we have adverted—1st, the difficulty of getting able Ministers to work together; 2nd, the difficulty of getting the King and his Ministers to agree on the share which each should have in directing public affairs.

A ruler who will not listen to disagreeable advice, is always in danger. Such unwillingness was certainly fatal to Louis Philippe. The reign of that Prince was wise and prosperous as long as he had a cabinet containing influential Ministers who did not fear to contradict him. As such Ministers disappeared, it became selfish, unpopular, weak, and doomed. A despotism has its advantages; a representative government has its advantages; but the most difficult and dangerous government is that in which a Prince tries to combine a practical autocracy with the theory of free institutions. Such a Prince is the constant subject of suspicion and misrepresentation. If anything goes wrong, he has all the discredit. If, on the contrary, anything goes right, it is the interest of the persons who serve him to take the credit to themselves, and the interest of the public to believe them. The position is a false one; and even more false when the Sovereign who passes for having the desire to be absolute has not really that desire. A person with a strong will at the head of affairs can generally succeed in carrying out his intentions,

intentions, and the entity which he gives to his policy and the prestige which he gains from his authority may compensate for the dangers he provokes. But Louis Philippe was not actuated by the motive attributed to him. He had a great opinion of his own sagacity; he thought it natural that he should govern everyone, not on account of his royal dignity, but on account of his talent and experience, which laid him open to any one who affected to be struck by his wisdom, and mistrustful of any one who disputed his opinion. He was, moreover, very fond of talking, and restlessly fond of business. His sincere wish was to maintain constitutional government, but in thinking he was better able to do so than any one else, his conduct and his principles were at variance, and the constant *refrain* of his time that 'a constitutional king reigns and should not govern,' was a protest against habits more dangerous to himself than to his country.

His last experiment in the way of Ministers before M. Guizot came back into power was M. Thiers, who, faithful to his maxim of 'diversion,' had engaged France in a policy with respect to Egypt which carried him much further than he had originally intended. Mehemet Ali, then ruling in that country, had cultivated the protection of the French press, and had a considerable party in France which favoured his pretensions to the government of Syria, and even to the supreme authority at Constantinople. The principal Powers of Europe were alarmed at his ambition, and feared that it might provoke a catastrophe in the East, for which they were not prepared. They were resolved, therefore, to arrest it, and addressed themselves to the French Government, asking its co-operation in that task. This co-operation was not refused by the Ministers preceding M. Thiers; indeed, everything proposed was accepted on principle, but objected to in detail. 'What you say is perfectly true as to the necessity of restraining Mehemet Ali,' said Marshal Soult, who never met the question at issue frankly, 'but the plan you suggest for the purpose is not a good one.' M. Thiers, on coming into office, determined on settling the question which he had thus found in suspense, but fell into the common mistake of thinking he could outwit all the world. His project was to prolong discussions with England, whilst he was endeavouring to negociate some arrangement with Mehemet Ali and the Porte to the advantage of the former; his intention being then to turn round to the other Governments and say, 'The affair is arranged; France has arranged it: there is nothing more to say or do in the matter. No one can assume to be more Turk than the Turks.' M. Guizot, the French ambassador in England, was to aid in

in this scheme. But it was soon detected or divined, and Lord Palmerston then, without further consultation with France, concluded a treaty with Russia and Austria. M. Thiers and M. Guizot did not learn that such a treaty was in contemplation till it was signed. The blow was severe—the humiliation great. M. Thiers accused M. Guizot of not keeping him properly informed. M. Guizot said, on the contrary, that he had warned M. Thiers that his policy was impracticable, and would lead to the result which actually arrived. The fact was that both had been deceived by the language of persons in or about the English Government who were inimical to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and by whose opposition the French Minister and the French Ambassador thought that Lord Palmerston would be prevented from adopting any decided course.

But the policy of England having been decided, what was that of France to be? M. Guizot was for frankly accepting a disagreeable situation, which he thought could not then be changed. M. Thiers, on the contrary, was for keeping the grievance of which he complained alive until he was prepared to resent it, and proposed a plan of military and maritime organisation which would, when complete, place him in a position to demand some reparation as an alternative for war. Louis Philippe adopted the policy of the Ambassador against that of the Minister, and M. Guizot replaced M. Thiers as the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The position was a delicate and difficult one. For the Ambassador to replace the Minister whose views he had been charged with carrying out was in itself a difficulty. But one must do M. Guizot the justice of saying that difficulties never arrested him. The promptitude and facility with which Mehemet Ali was defeated in Syria, and the humility with which he accepted the conditions offered him by the allies, dissipated also the delusions that had been propagated as to his power. The French people rarely cling to the unfortunate, and the prevalent disposition of men of sense was to make the best of a bad business, and to close a quarrel of diplomacy which had been already practically terminated by facts. The change of government in England, moreover, removed the sort of personal feeling which the skill and courage of Lord Palmerston had inflicted on the vanity of a rival State; and M. Guizot finally succeeded in the laudable object with which his administration had commenced, viz. that of reconciling the two countries on whose friendly relations depend in no slight degree the interests of civilisation.

But, notwithstanding the gentleness and moderation with which our Foreign Secretary now strove to avoid all complications

tions with France, a new question, as dangerous as the Egyptian one, almost immediately arose; for that restlessness which is the chronic malady of French Governments cannot for any length of time be soothed by the most potent anodynes. An ambition never quiet, having quitted the Mediterranean, made a stretch towards the Pacific, and did not disdain the annexation to the French dominions of the little Marquesas islands, M. Guizot giving no other reason for taking than that France wanted them.

The Admiral sent out to make this acquisition by the orders of his Government thought he would do a little business of the same kind on his own account, set up the French flag in the Marquesas Islands, sailed to the Society Islands, and having frightened poor Queen Pomare out of her wits, quieted her mind by taking her and Tahiti under French protection. M. Guizot expresses himself very reasonably about this; and allows that, considering our missionaries had exercised an extensive and beneficial influence over Tahiti for upwards of forty years, and had on two occasions refused the sovereignty of it, Admiral Dupetit Thouar's precipitation was not a little likely to create surprise and ill-feeling in England. Nevertheless, he accepts the protectorate. But the Admiral was already dissatisfied at the incompleteness of his conquest; and, construing the right of protecting Queen Pomare into a right of deposing her, had by this time set her Majesty aside and proclaimed the King of the French as her successor. M. Guizot, with some courage, refused to alter the situation of protectorate into that of sovereignty. But new complications ensued. Mr. Pritchard, who had been acting as British Consul until the French dominion was proclaimed, was seized, imprisoned, and ill-treated by the French authorities without the form or reality of justice. Our Government got a shabby satisfaction of 1000*l.*, and M. Guizot, who treated us with as little ceremony as it was possible for one nation to show to another without insolently provoking war, was nearly succumbing under an accusation of over-courtesy.

We have hitherto been speaking of M. Guizot's career as contained in preceding volumes; we now proceed to its continuation in the volume which lies before us. That volume—the eighth of the Memoirs—begins with a disquisition on free Governments, which M. Guizot aptly describes as admitting a variety of forms, but excluding confusion and exacting responsibility. He then speaks of the retirement of Marshal Soult, which placed him (M. Guizot) nominally as well as really at the head of the French Ministry; describes the commencement of that growing opposition before which he ultimately fell; speaks of the doubts which the King at times entertained as to the establishment of representative

representative institutions in France; avows his own sanguine disposition; boasts of the absolute obedience he exacted from his party; of the vigour and spirit with which he had animated it; affirms that the electoral privilege was exercised in France with more purity than either in England or America; and passes over in silence the limited right of suffrage and the immense influence of Government, which were, in fact, the real causes of discontent.

The visit of the Duc de Bordeaux to London is spoken of in suitable terms; but the pages of most interest in this portion of Vol. VIII. exhibit extracts from Louis Philippe's letters intended to prove the entire sympathy between the Sovereign and his distinguished servant, and leaving upon the whole the impression that the Minister, by flattering skilfully and speaking confidently, kept his Majesty in that agreeable state of mind from which no sovereign likes to be aroused. M. Guizot then passes on to foreign affairs, and treats consecutively of Spain, Switzerland, and Rome, returning finally to Paris, in which he describes the dropping of the curtain on that monarchy which his talents illustrated and his character overthrew.

The events in Spain have the most historical interest, and were productive of the most important consequences; of these we shall speak in the most detail.

It must have been by a singular fatality that, after having rescued their country with skill and dignity from the Egyptian difficulty, having scrambled with dexterity and good fortune out of the Pritchard outrage, Louis Philippe and his Minister—who, we really believe, desired to maintain friendly relations with Great Britain—entered on a policy in the Spanish peninsula which could not fail, a little sooner or a little later, to produce serious disagreement with our Government and to shock the moral sense of all Europe by its coldblooded immorality and injustice. Our words are not too strong.

As we began by saying, the world may always be pretty sure that a man is not that which he strives particularly to appear. M. Guizot strives in the question of the Spanish marriages to appear exceedingly moderate, exceedingly wise, and exceedingly fair. But little does he merit the praise of moderation, wisdom, or fairness. As writers on historical events we cannot but condemn his policy, and as Englishmen we find ourselves bound to defend England and Englishmen from his one-sided statements and unjust attacks. The story of these alliances opens with a pretension to prevent the young Queen of Spain from marrying any one but a descendant of Philippe V. We doubt if any consideration

sideration could have justified a pretension so unreasonable. The question which the French Government undertook to determine was to affect the private life, the happiness or woe, of a young woman: this young woman the Queen of an independent nation.

We say we doubt if any considerations could have justified a pretension so unreasonable. But the considerations which influenced them had not even a political excuse: there was not one Frenchman in a hundred who cared two straws whether Queen Isabella married a descendant of Philippe V. or any other prince. The only Frenchman, in fact, interested in this question was Louis Philippe himself, whose interest sprang mainly from family pride.

If M. Guizot really thought that the interests of France were involved in the Queen of Spain marrying any of the insignificant princes of the Bourbon family, he was a very short-sighted politician; if he did not think this, and merely wished to please the Sovereign by adopting as a French idea a Bourbon speculation, he might have been a good courtier, but he was not a good patriot. The true Spanish policy of France was to evince an interest in the prosperity of Spain, and in the happiness of her Queen. The French Government, on the contrary, said, 'We do not care about the domestic happiness of the Queen of Spain as a woman; we do not care about her dignity and independence as a Sovereign; we will not allow her to marry as she may wish, nor as her nation may desire; we insist on her marrying as His Majesty Louis Philippe considers best for the illustration of his race.' It is difficult to find an example in history of so gross an impertinence, or of so serious an injustice. We think ourselves that England should have repudiated as preposterous the principle which the French Government put forward, and declined entering into any discussion on the question of the Queen of Spain's marriage, until that principle was withdrawn. Such clear and decided language would have procured a sympathy in Spain and in Europe that would have at once checked an arrogance with which it was difficult to come to terms.

The British Government, however, was justly desirous to maintain good relations with that of France, and without, perhaps, sufficiently recognising that such relations are often better maintained by firmly resisting exaggerated pretensions than by humouring them, Lord Aberdeen said that, though he could not but assert that the Queen of Spain had a right to marry as she might think proper, he would do nothing to oppose an alliance with a Bourbon prince, provided such a prince could be found agreeable to Her Majesty and the Spanish nation, and provided the King of the French renounced all design of a marriage

with

with one of his own sons. The King made this renunciation, and the way was thus opened for placing a Bourbon on the Spanish throne.

But it was soon seen that concessions always lead to concessions, and consequently M. Guizot ere long informed the Cabinet of St. James's that he maintained the same principle with respect to the Infanta that he did as to the Queen, and that both must marry within the Bourbon line, adding that a marriage between Doña Fernanda and the Duc de Montpensier was, in fact, already arranged. Thus the King of the French took possession of the two Spanish princesses as his family right.

The English Government, still anxious to avoid a difference with the French Government, again assented to the accomplishment of Louis Philippe's new desire; making, however, one stipulation, viz., that, until the Queen should have children, the Infanta's marriage with a French prince should not take place; and this condition was unequivocally accepted. In this manner the French Government bound itself to two things: 1st. That the King of the French would not marry any of his sons to the Queen of Spain; and 2ndly, that his youngest son should not marry the Queen's sister until the Queen had issue. On the other hand, the English Government engaged, on these conditions, not to oppose the marriage of the Queen of Spain with any of the descendants of Philippe V.; and also to throw no impediment in the way of the Infanta's marriage with the Duc de Montpensier. But the English Government never promised to aid the French Government in restricting the Queen of Spain's liberty; declaring, on the contrary, that her choice should be free.

In the mean time the French Government had adopted all the measures which it deemed best calculated to smooth the way to its designs. General Espartero was acting as Regent when the question of Queen Isabella's marriage was first mooted, and he was hostile to a Bourbon alliance; but an insurrection broke out against him and was made triumphant; as M. Guizot says that the French Government had nothing to do with this insurrection, we can only suppose M. Guizot ignorant of a fact which can be proved by hundreds, and which his own agents never scrupled to avow.

Nor was the removal of Espartero himself the only gain that his downfall brought to the French cause. The party of politicians which this incident was the means of bringing into power—known in Spanish history by the title of '*Moderados*'—had long been recognised as a party peculiarly protected by France, and peculiarly devoted to her interests. To give this rty more efficiency, the Queen-mother, its leader, and a Princess

Princess of great character and ability, was brought back to Madrid. So far, then, M. Guizot had everything in his favour. The hostile Regent was deposed, the Moderados were in office, and the Queen-mother, all-powerful over adherents and her daughter, was on the spot. Nothing remained for M. Guizot but to select an agent who would reflect his own zeal.

The agent he chose was M. Bresson; the least scrupulous and the most energetic of the French diplomatists; a man of ability, but devoured by vanity; who had already signalised himself at Brussels by procuring, as a personal triumph, the offer of the Belgian crown to the Duc de Nemours, though he knew perfectly well that his Government could not accept it. Arrogant, overbearing, and spiteful to all who did not crouch to his authority, he had also that susceptibility touching his official dignity which is often found amongst men who arrive at a high position after starting from a comparatively low one. His early years had been passed in a counting-house. Some idea of this bourgeois Ambassador may be gathered from the following anecdote, for which M. Guizot himself is the authority.

The representatives of England and France were to live on the most friendly footing, and act as much as possible together. These were their instructions: but M. Bresson paid little attention to them, and was sending off courier after courier, maintaining the most strict reserve as to the business by which he was so remarkably occupied. We should suppose that his colleague wished to avoid anything like a formal complaint of such conduct, and yet wished to show that he remarked it. Thus, at the moment that his own messenger was starting off, he writes three lines in apparent haste, and on an unceremonious piece of paper, and sends them to the Count. This is the text:—

'Mon cher Bresson,—Vos courriers partent en foule comme des flocons de neige. L'air en est obscurci. Quel orage présage ceci? Dites moi s'il y a quelque chose qui vaille la peine d'être dit, et que vous puissiez me dire, pour que je charge de cette information mon pauvre et solitaire messager.

'Tout à vous,

'H. Bulwer.'

M. Bresson gives no information as to his couriers, but is exceedingly shocked, not at the contents of the note, but at the paper on which it was written; and though he closes his reply with *mille et mille amitiés*, notifies to M. Guizot the manner in which he had carefully blotted it, so as to pay off blot with blot. He writes:

'Il faut que je vous amuse. Voici un billet original de Bulwer te'

que je l'ai reçu. J'ai pris un papier du même format, dont j'ai déchiré le bord, sur lequel j'ai versé autant d'encre, et écrit en crayon ce que vous trouverez sur le verso.'

A high-bred Frenchman of the old school, who wished to keep up his dignity and administer a rebuke, would have pursued an exactly opposite course: he would have been more punctilious than before in the observance of what he deemed the *convenances.* M. Guizot does not see this; nor is he aware of the extreme indiscretion of which he himself has been guilty in publishing the concluding sentences of his plenipotentiary's note, which we omit.

It may be conceived that a vain, violent, and punctilious man might be a good person to bully a Spanish Court, but certainly he was not the best man to act conjointly with an English gentleman, and the attempt at mutual confidence soon after ceased. M. Guizot, to a certain degree, admits his agent's faults; but his main object appears to have been that of having a representative at Madrid who would do any desperate thing at a desperate moment, and in this respect M. Bresson suited him.

Nor was he disposed to limit the influence of which he fancied himself possessed, simply to the royal marriages. Spain had a quarrel with the Moors at Ceuta. It is well known that this Spanish fortress is opposite our more celebrated one, which relies for its supplies on the African coast. If that coast, indeed, were in hostile hands, Gibraltar could not long remain in ours. We had done our best to compose the differences between Moors and Spaniards, and had in fact sent our Consul-General at Tangiers to Fez for that purpose; but his mission had failed. The Spanish Consul-General had quitted Tangiers: the Spanish army was collected and ready to embark at Algeziras, when the French, who had also picked up a quarrel with the Moors, were on the point of joining their forces with those of Queen Isabella. M. Bresson already exulted in the idea of the French and Spanish flags being intermingled in family union for projected conquests.

Luckily (the Queen and Court being then at Valencia) the British Minister saw General Narvaez, President of the Spanish Cabinet, and placed so strongly before him the inconveniences and dangers likely to result from a Franco-Spanish expedition which might end by giving Spain a far more formidable neighbour than the Emperor of Morocco, that the General, who, whatever his faults, was a patriot after his fashion, was startled.

The conversation that ensued as related to us (we believe, accurately), is so singular, that we record it:—

'All that you say is true,' said Narvaez; 'but Spain cannot sacrifice

sacrifice her honour. *You* see the points of difference. If *you* will go to Tangiers at once and induce the Governor, who I know has full powers to treat, to agree to terms which as an English gentleman you would consider honourable in a similar case to your own country, I will give you, as a Spanish gentleman, my honour that I will accept any terms you agree to.'

'I am very much flattered, General,' replied Sir Henry Bulwer, 'by your confidence, but I have no instructions; there is no time to obtain them. Will you give me three lines as an authority for my quitting my post and undertaking this adventure?'

'Not a line. *I trust you—you must trust me;* and if you go you must start at once, for our army is ready to embark.'

Sir Henry went; the government at Tangiers agreed to the proposals he made; the Spanish Government at once accepted them; our Envoy carried back the Spanish Consul-General to his post; the Spanish quarrel was arranged, and within two or three days afterwards, strange to say, the French quarrel was settled also. But M. Guizot never once alludes to the part that England played in this affair; the fault of his narrative being the too frequent omission of any one whom he treats as an antagonist and of any particulars in which his own hand or that of his agent is not predominant.

We return from this episode to the affair which especially occupied the Tuileries. Count Trapani, a Neapolitan Prince, had been selected by the Queen-Mother and her uncle as the Bourbon who should give heirs to the Spanish throne. The British government had ordered its representative neither to favour nor oppose this marriage, *provided the Spanish nation received it without repugnance.* M. Guizot gives, in a despatch from Count Bresson, a curious account of a conversation between the French Ambassador and the English minister on this subject.

'Il (Sir Henry Bulwer) a passé en revue,' says M. Bresson, 'tous les candidats. Il diminuait les chances du Prince de Naples, il en découvrait au fils de Don Carlos, il croyait celles du Duc de Cadiz et du Duc de Seville assez considérables, il disait du Prince de Cobourg qu'il ne voyait pas pourquoi l'Angleterre le soutiendrait, ni pourquoi la France le repousserait, c'était à ses yeux un choix indifférent.'—Ch. xlv. p. 214.

It will be seen from this extract that the British Minister forewarned his colleague that the Neapolitan alliance would encounter grave obstacles, that one of the Spanish Princes had the best chance (both predictions proving eventually true), and spoke of a Prince of the House of Saxe-Cobourg as a candidate whom, as it appeared to him, England had no reason to support, and

France no reason to oppose. The frank and manly manner in which these observations were made would, we think, have pleased most men and won their confidence; but M. Bresson flies up because the English Minister did not, in spite of his instructions, enter with zeal into the Neapolitan crusade, and M. Guizot himself observes subsequently with an air of reproach:—

'Sir Henri Bulwer s'appliqua à faire ressortir l'impopularité du mariage Napolitain, et dans les momens où il se montrait le plus favorable à cette ambitionsion il l'accepta de façon à ce que si elle échouait on ne fît pas un échec pour son gouvernement.'—p. 214.

We cannot see any cause of grievance here. Sir Henry Bulwer from the first pointed out that the Neapolitan marriage was next to impossible, and it proved impossible. Even when most favourable to this marriage, he did not wish that his government should be exposed to a failure if it did not succeed. Were these faults? M. Guizot always argues as if the goodness or badness of a British Minister or Ambassador depended on his serving the views of France. Now Sir Henry Bulwer is cried down because he does not wish his government to be compromised about a foolish marriage that France pushed forward at all hazards, and now Lord Aberdeen is praised for being far more engaged to support the French views than according to any existing document he ever was.

As time rolled on, events showed that our Minister had not exaggerated the difficulties that Count Trapani would encounter. The people began to call a dishclout (which in Spanish is *trapo*) '*trapani:*' this in Spain was a fatal sign, and ere long it became pretty clear that the Neapolitan candidate could not obtain the Queen's hand with the consent of the Spanish nation. The prejudice was unreasonable, but the Spaniard, having ruled in Naples, had a contempt for the Neapolitan, with which it was useless to reason. What was to be done? Sir Henry Bulwer thought that a scheme was now formed for making the obnoxious marriage *coûte qui coûte*, notwithstanding its unpopularity; that it was to be made by General Narvaez; that the French Ambassador knew of this scheme, and favoured it. This opinion he communicated to his government. Such a project was not only unfair to Spain, it was unfair to England, which had stipulated that no marriage should be imposed on the Spanish people; and, moreover, it was uncongenial with the opinions that prevailed in France: M. Guizot consequently denies it with vehemence and acerbity. 'Le complot allégué par Mr. Bulwer était aussi invraisemblable qu'imaginaire.' We will say nothing of our

our own information on this subject, though we heard this very summer from a Spanish gentleman that he himself was in the plot which Sir H. Bulwer denounced. M. Guizot himself may be cited as a good authority against his own denegation. We quote from his work, page 244:—

'Le Général Narvaez se releva et rentra au pouvoir seul avec quelques uns de ses amis personnels, accepté comme un homme fort par les deux reines alarmées, et *promettant de conclure en trois mois le mariage Napolitain.*'

If M. Bresson had nothing to do with the return of Narvaez to power under these circumstances, he at least knew the plans and plots with which Narvaez did return; and moreover had an interview with him shortly after he was in office, from which he retires charmed and enthusiastic, saying in his report: 'Narvaez est bien supérieur aux autres, et bien plus capable de *nous mener au port.*' He relates, also, that he had told Narvaez that although the French Government could not support the illegal proceedings by which he had seized the supreme authority under the Crown, and suppressed the Constitution, nevertheless, 'le fait *accompli sans nous*, nous n'avions d'autre pensée que de l'aider à gagner *la périlleuse partie* qu'il venait d'engager.'

There may be some error in dates or details; but no one can read these passages and doubt that General Narvaez was appointed by the Spanish Court for the express purpose for which Sir Henry Bulwer conjectured he was appointed; that Count Bresson, who represented the Government of July, could not aid ostensibly in putting down liberty and the press, but was not sorry at their having been put down, and that he considered the man who had put them down the best agent for carrying out the marriage to which France had committed herself.

We now enter on a new scene of this fatal drama. The only Bourbon on whom Queen Christina and Louis Philippe could agree was Count Trapani, for he was the nephew of the one and the brother of the other. When he was out of the question the Spanish Princes were the sole remaining Bourbon candidates; they were more to the taste of the Spaniards, as Sir Henry Bulwer had told M. Bresson from the commencement, than a Neapolitan. Still there were serious drawbacks to their chances. The son of Don Carlos had many respectable partisans. But besides the question of his own pretensions, which might possibly have been settled, there was a question which was insurmountable. There was the army or quondam army of Don Carlos. There was the army of the Queen-Mother, who had raised it as Regent and head of her daughter's cause. If a son of Don Carlos became King

of Spain, the Carlist army and its officers would expect to be recognised, and thus become formidable rivals for pay, rank, and honours to the existing army and its officers. It was found impossible to arrange this difficulty.

On the other hand, the two sons of Don Francisco, King Ferdinand's brother, were no favourites at Court. Against the first, private objections were stated which, if true, ought to have eliminated the present King from the list of pretenders. As to Don Enrique, the younger brother, he was supposed to have inherited the hatred which his mother, then dead, had entertained towards her sister Queen Christina; and, moreover, he was at that time the avowed chief of the Progresistas, that is, of the party in opposition; on which account he was in exile.

The persistent determination of the French Government therefore to marry the Queen to a Bourbon, the Count Trapani's candidature having failed, became intolerable. The Court and Government both revolted at it. The Prince they then looked to was the one who had been named in the conversation already mentioned between Sir Henry Bulwer and M. Bresson, viz., a Prince of the House of Saxe-Cobourg. The selection of a Prince of this House arose not merely from the idea that he was connected with the Royal Family of England, but from the fact that he was equally connected with the Royal Family of France; indeed, by being a Catholic, he was more closely connected with the Catholic Royal Family of France than with the Protestant Royal Family of England. The Government of England could have no possible reason for pushing forward this alliance; the Government of France no plausible reason for opposing it. The only objection that could be taken was the family one of Louis Philippe, viz., that the proposed husband was not a Bourbon. But when the tranquillity of Spain, and the happiness of its Sovereign, and the concord of Europe, were all concerned in not carrying to an extreme a most absurd pretension of family pride, there was no irrational hope that this pretension would be ultimately laid aside if Spain acted resolutely and asserted her rights.

This was the Queen-Mother's opinion. She determined, therefore, on addressing a letter containing the proposal for a marriage between Queen Isabella and Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg to the Duke of Saxe-Cobourg then at Lisbon: and she requested Sir Henry Bulwer to allow this letter to go, as her letters and the despatches of the Spanish Government could always go, by his messenger. She told him, however, what the letter contained. Sir Henry Bulwer would not refuse a letter from the Queen-Mother to the Duke of Saxe-Cobourg. He would not argue

argue against a Cobourg marriage, because his Government had said that the Queen of Spain was free to marry whom she thought proper; but he said to the Queen-Mother what he had formerly said to Count Bresson, that a Cobourg marriage was not an English one, and that he saw no reason for supposing that the English Government would support it as if it were.

What seems clear at this juncture is the complete discomfiture of M. Guizot and his Ambassador. M. Guizot fancied that his power at Madrid was supreme, that the Queen-Mother and the Moderado party were his passive tools; M. Bresson, that by the spies he had about the Court and those he had put about the British Minister (especially a certain M. Donoso Cortes, who was the Queen's Secretary, and whom he is constantly citing), not a mouse could stir in the Royal Palace or the British Embassy without his receiving a report of the disturbance. And yet, just at this moment of triumphant security, comes to M. Guizot the news of which neither he nor the King could at first believe the correctness, whilst a telegram to M. Bresson makes that gentleman bound from his bed. 'Elle (the telegraphic despatch) est venue ce matin me faire bondir hors de mon lit.' What said this telegraphic despatch? That Lord Aberdeen had informed the French Ambassador in London of Queen Christina's letter to the Duke of Saxe-Cobourg—at Lisbon.

This is—'a situation;' and no doubt the English Minister on the French stage would be described as a monster of cleverness, who had imperceptibly drawn the Spanish Government and Court into his arms when M. Bresson fancied he had them locked firmly in his embraces. M. Guizot also, who at times denies the influence, here mystifies and exaggerates it; and instead of confessing that the conduct of Queen Christina had been the natural result of the position in which he had placed her, tries to represent it as the result of Sir H. Bulwer's representations. But Sir Henry Bulwer applies to M. Isturitz, with whom all discussion as to the Queen of Spain's marriage with a Cobourg Prince had passed, to say what had been his real language concerning it; M. Isturitz writes thus:—

(Enclosure in No. 48.)

M. Isturitz to Mr. Bulwer.

'June 5, 1846.

'Mon cher Ami,—J'ai reçu votre lettre d'hier dans laquelle vous me désirez de vous dire si vous m'avez jamais tenu sur le mariage de ma Souveraine un autre langage que celui-ci—"Mon Gouvernement regarde le mariage de la Reine d'Espagne comme une question purement Espagnole. Il reconnaît l'indépendance de l'Espagne là-dedans;

mais

mais il préférera un descendant de Philippe V., si un tel époux était agréable à la Reine d'Espagne et à sa nation. Il n'a aucun désir pour un mariage avec un Prince de Saxe-Cobourg, aucun intérêt dans ce mariage qui peut même lui être un embarras."

'Je me plais à témoigner de l'exactitude de ces mots et m'empresse de vous redire l'assurance de mon estime très amicale.'—Quoted from 'Correspondence on Spanish Marriages,' p. 94.

This seems a pretty general and decisive answer to all M. Guizot's charges; and for this reason we do not stop to correct a variety of erroneous statements by which it was attempted, not very handsomely, to support them.

We have lingered somewhat long on this epoch in these affairs, for it is the one on which M. Guizot most insists; but we pass on now to explain how, after having suffered so signal and complete a defeat as that we have described, he was enabled to gain a victory more unfortunate than any defeat he could have sustained.

Lord Palmerston, in succeeding Lord Aberdeen, laboured under one disadvantage. When he had formerly been in power, the all-dominant party in Spanish affairs was the Progresista one. It is difficult for a foreigner to understand that a party in Spain is everything when in office; nothing when out of it. At the moment we are speaking of, the leading Progresistas were exiles in London, and altogether without authority or influence in Spain.

Lord Palmerston did not entirely realise this, and shortly after his entry into affairs wrote to the English Minister at Madrid a despatch, in which he spoke in violent terms of the Moderado party then directing the Spanish Government; and, in mentioning the candidates for the Queen's hand, put Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg at the head of the list. Had he merely sent this despatch to Sir Henry Bulwer, it would not have signified; but he gave a copy of it to the French Government, and this confidence was misplaced. In the first place, King Louis Philippe was alarmed at seeing Prince Leopold at the head of the list of candidates for Queen Isabella's hand. In the next place, the Spanish Government, composed of Moderados, was alarmed and alienated by the reprobation of their party, of which M. Guizot at once informed them, urging M. Bresson to make the most of this advantage:

'Le parti modéré, la Reine Christine, M. Isturitz comme M. Mou, ne peuvent se méprendre sur le sens et la portée politique de la dépêche de Lord Palmerston. C'est bien le langage du patron des Progresistas.'—'Mémoires,' p. 301.

'*Mr.*

'*Mr. Bulwer to Viscount Palmerston.*

'August 22, 1846.

'The French Government has not failed to turn to account its knowledge of the despatch, July 19, by representing it as a declaration of hostility against the Spanish Ministry and established influences in Spain.'—'Spanish Correspondence.'

But this was not all: Lord Palmerston, though he had appeared to give Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg a preference in his public despatch, wrote privately to Sir Henry Bulwer, recommending him especially to urge the candidature of Don Enrique, the second son of Don Francisco, of whom we have already spoken as hateful to the Queen-Mother, and as having placed himself at the head of the Progresistas. Sir Henry Bulwer saw at once the consequence of this: already the Moderados were offended, and Louis Philippe and M. Guizot apprehensive. The advocacy of Don Henry would equally frighten and irritate the Spanish Court.

His advice, therefore, was not to press a marriage with Don Enrique. 'That prince,' he said, 'could only arrive at the throne by a revolution which was then impossible.' We ought, as he thought, either clearly to renounce the Cobourg alliance in such a way as would satisfy the King of the French, or to satisfy Queen Christina by clearly giving up Don Enrique. To leave the marriage of the Cobourg prince hanging over the head of one party, and the marriage of the Progresista candidate over the head of the other, would, in his opinion, loosen our hold both over the French Government and the Spanish Government, and bring them to unite for carrying out some common plan for averting a present danger without regard to past promises or pledges. On the other hand, the Progresistas in London told Lord Palmerston that by alarming Louis Philippe as to a Cobourg, that monarch would adopt the candidature of Prince Henry as a Bourbon; and that if France and England both adopted this prince, the Spanish Court would not dare to refuse him. Count Jarnac also, the French chargé-d'affaires in London, encouraged this notion, and gave Lord Palmerston reason to believe that he might count on M. Guizot's assistance in favour of the Progresista candidate:—

'*Viscount Palmerston to Mr. Bulwer.*

'Foreign Office, August 16, 1846.

'I tell Count Jarnac . . . . that the only Spanish Prince who could be properly chosen is Don Enrique. To this Count Jarnac replied by expressing his belief that if we could settle down to that decision, the French

French Government would go along with us in pressing that arrangement.'—'Spanish Correspondence.'

Lord Palmerston not unnaturally trusted Count Jarnac, and again urged the English representative at Madrid to press Don Enrique upon the Spanish Government and Court in the most decided manner. The British Minister obeyed Lord Palmerston's final instructions, but what he had anticipated took place: Queen Christina and King Louis Philippe at once struck their bargain, and the two marriages, to take place at the same time, were announced.

This we believe to be a tolerably correct account of a transaction that has hitherto remained in some degree a diplomatic mystery. But if Lord Palmerston had in some degree miscalculated as to events, this was simply owing to his faith in engagements which his own high and honourable character made him believe would be kept.

M. Guizot has endeavoured to excuse his conduct in breaking these engagements with all the eloquence and argument which are at the disposal of his masterly intellect. He would in the first place endeavour to make out that the English Government had tried to effect a marriage out of the Bourbon line; that this was contrary to its agreement, and therefore relieved him from his. Here he signally fails. We had never promised to prevent every other marriage than a Bourbon one, but we had certainly never attempted to make any other.

In the case of the British Minister, M. Isturitz declares that Sir Henry had expressly stated 'that the British Government did not desire a Cobourg marriage, and that such a marriage would cause it embarrassment.' But Lord Aberdeen had done more; he had prevented a Cobourg marriage, which would certainly have taken place without his interference; whilst Lord Palmerston, by pressing a Bourbon marriage as against a Cobourg one, had actually offended the Spanish Government and reinstated the French influence at Madrid, giving M. Guizot thereby the power to make the trick which won him the game he must otherwise have fairly lost. M. Guizot, indeed, sensible that his case cannot stand on the ground where he first places it, glides on to another, and refers to a particular communication which he says he made to Lord Aberdeen on the 27th of February, 1846, that is, some months before the marriages took place.

The communication on which so much stress is laid appears to have been a memorandum which the French Ambassador, Count St. Aulaire, read to Lord Aberdeen. But this memorandum, which M. Guizot gives, contains, perhaps, the strongest case

case against the French Government that has ever yet been made out. In it M. Guizot recapitulates all the objections that then existed to a marriage with a descendant of Philip V. He acknowledges that it is disagreeable to the Royal Family of Spain and the Spanish Government, and has no partisans amongst the Spanish people. These are his words:—

'Voici quelle est maintenant la situation des Princes descendants de Philippe V. et prétendant ou pouvant prétendre à la main de la Reine d'Espagne:—

'Le Prince de Lucque est marié.

'Le Comte de Trapani est fort compromis: 1°. Par l'explosion qui a eu lieu contre lui; 2°. Par la *chute de Général Narvaez.*

'Les fils de l'Infant Don François de Paul sont fort compromis: par leurs fausses démarches; par leur intimité avec le parti radical et l'antipathie du parti modéré; par le mauvais vouloir de la reine-mère et de la *jeune reine elle-même.*

'Les fils de Don Carlos sont quant à présent impossibles: 1°. Par l'opposition hautement proclamée de tous les partis; 2°. Par leur exclusion formellement prononcée dans la constitution: 3°. Par leurs propres dispositions toujours fort eloignées de la conduite qui pourrait seule leur rendre quelques chances.

'La situation actuelle des descendants de Philippe V. dans la question du mariage de la Reine d'Espagne est donc devenue mauvaise.'

Thus M. Guizot recapitulates all the disadvantages which a Bourbon marriage presents, and at what conclusions does he arrive? Why, that such a marriage must *take place*, and that England *must* aid him in bringing it about and in putting aside any other candidates than those whom he prescribes. If she does not do this, then the King of the French will break the promise he had formerly made to the English Government, and immediately demand the hand of the Queen or the Infanta, as he may think proper, for the Duke of Montpensier:—

'Nous désirons sincèrement que les choses n'en viennent point à cette extrémité.

'Nous ne voyons qu'un moyen de la prévenir: que le Cabinet anglais s'unisse activement à nous.

'Pour remettre à flot l'un des descendants de Philippe V., n'importe lequel, et préparer son mariage avec la Reine Isabelle.

'Pour empêcher en attendant le mariage de l'Infante soit avec le Prince Léopold de Cobourg soit avec tout prince étranger aux descendants de Philippe V.'—'Mémoires,' p. 254.

It is difficult to conceive a communication more insulting to English honour. The French Government had declared it would not put forward a son of the King of the French for the Queen

of

of Spain's hand. The English Government had declared that the Queen of Spain was free to marry any one save a son of the King of the French. This was agreed upon, and now M. Guizot announces that he shall not abide by his declaration unless England abandons her principle. In short, the English Government is to join the French Government in forcing the Queen of Spain to make a marriage which M. Guizot avows is against her Majesty's inclination; or it is threatened with M. Guizot's strongest displeasure and the strongest act that the French Government can commit against its own engagements and against British policy and interests.

But M. Guizot does not tell us how Lord Aberdeen received the reading of this memorable document. Lord Aberdeen does not communicate a word of it to Lord Palmerston when Lord Palmerston comes into office. He does not even mention it to Sir Henry Bulwer;* and in a despatch, June 22nd, 1846, which he writes to the Duke of Sotomayor, he says, 'We have always denied, and still deny, the right or pretension of the French Government to impose a member of any family upon the Spanish nation as the husband of the Queen of Spain, or to control in any way the decision of a question so purely Spanish.' He adds, 'that England had no objections to a descendant of Philip V. as a husband for the Queen, provided such choice should be conformable to the interests of her Majesty and the interests of her Majesty's government; but that if it is not, she is to act in such a manner as may be dictated by a sense of her own dignity and interest: and that if the French government, which Lord Aberdeen cannot believe, should interfere with the independence which Spain in such a matter has a right to exercise, she would, without doubt, receive the warmest sympathy of all Europe.' Thus it does not appear by this despatch in June that Lord Aberdeen's mind had been affected by any communication in February.

We can have no doubt that if M. Guizot says his memorandum was read, it *was* read; but much depends on the accompanying circumstances. What formality was given to it? What reply was made to it? Why was not a copy left? We think we may venture to say that no Foreign Secretary who thought he had received a serious communication on which rested the whole of a most important question between England and France relative to Spain, would have left it unrecorded, would have kept his successor, who had to treat this grave matter, uninformed of it, would have left his representative at Madrid with-

* See Despatch, Nov. 7, 1846, Sir H. Bulwer.

out

out an official or even private intimation of it. We cannot, then, help believing that Lord Aberdeen treated the communication here referred to as it merited; and that, considering it withdrawn in virtue of his observations, he purposely omitted taking notice of it, with the amiable desire of not compromising the French Government and irritating the English nation. This is the only supposition that the mingled prudence, dignity, and kindness of Lord Aberdeen permit us to entertain. At all events, it was evident that when Lord Palmerston wrote his despatch of July 19th—in which he names Prince Leopold of Saxe-Cobourg—he knew nothing of M. Guizot's memorandum of February. Why, if M. Guizot meant to act fairly and straightforwardly, did he not mention this memorandum to Lord Palmerston? Why did he not say to Lord Palmerston what he says he had said to Lord Aberdeen? The more positively he thought Lord Palmerston meant to support a Cobourg Prince, the more he was bound to point out the consequences to him; if about to break pledges which Lord Palmerston thought binding, the more was he bound to show that he considered them binding no longer.

M. Guizot, it is true, made some menace of the same kind as that contained in the February memorandum to Lord Cowley at a far later period and under particular conditions.

'*Lord Cowley à Lord Palmerston.*

'13 Juillet, 1846.

'La nouvelle d'une proposition faite pour un mariage avec un Prince de la maison de Cobourg a occasionné ici la plus grande consternation. M. Guizot me dit *que si on persistait dans ce projet*, il conseillerait au Roi de mettre en avant M. le Duc de Montpensier comme candidat pour la main de la Reine.'

But at the moment when M. Guizot had the conversation that Lord Cowley repeats, he was under the apprehension that a Cobourg marriage was impending and that our Government might support it. Thus he qualifies his threat by saying '*si on persistait dans ce projet.*' At the moment that he consented to the marriage of the Infanta taking place simultaneously with that of the Queen, Lord Palmerston had repulsed the offers conveyed to him by the Duke of Sotomayor for a Cobourg marriage and was pressing a Bourbon one. The persistence alluded to could not be alleged. The British Government was frankly endeavouring to carry out the object which the French Government desired, when the French Government was surreptitiously carrying out the object to which it knew that the British Government was opposed.

In fact, the only clear explanation of an act, which was as unjustifiable

unjustifiable in its morality as unwise in its policy, slips out unperceived by the writer in M. Guizot's correspondence:—

'*M. Guizot à Lord Palmerston.*

'25 Janvier, 1847.

'*Il est notoire* que les deux mariages avaient été décidés en même temps et étaient associés l'un à l'autre. En sorte que si le second n'avait pas été convenu, le premier n'aurait pas eu lieu.'

M. Guizot had been defeated in his double attempt to constrain the Spanish Court and keep faith with the British; and therefore, with that intemperate zeal which in all contests governed this gifted man—who fancied himself so moderate and who was so violent—he hastened to secure a triumph which gratified his vanity, but which instantly weakened his influence and ultimately marred his ambition.

We may appear to have spoken with some severity of M. Guizot in regard to these Spanish marriages, of which we should have been glad not to treat, for we really entertain great respect for M. Guizot's talents (which as an orator and a writer are of the first order), and also for his character, which towers more lofty over his times from the many wrecks of shattered reputations which lie beneath it. He cut his way, moreover, from the middle ranks of life to the foremost place in a country where talent is the quality most appreciated, and where it would have been impossible to have risen, at the period of his career, to the highest rank without the highest abilities. But M. Guizot comes forward unnecessarily, uncalled for, to revive old disputes and to elevate himself at the expense of our countrymen and our country. Our exposition of what we consider his errors is in fact a simple defence of the men whom we think he has unjustly attacked, and we rank amongst them quite as much those whom he has praised for their complaisance to his designs as those whom he has assailed for their resistance. We are persuaded that he did not premeditate being unfair in action or in writing. As is a political contest, so is with him a political controversy—a battle. His blood gets heated, he lays aside all rules of argument, all courtesies of fence, and inflicts wounds with a sharpened point, believing he is merely touching with a buttoned foil.

We here leave this subject, which, though almost lost to our recollection amid the noisy rush of these stirring times, will furnish an interesting study to the future statesman who, whether in the calm of retirement or in the crowded city agitated by the question of the hour, may learn a lesson of moderation by reflecting how the wisest of men may be deceived as to the importance of events, and how frequently that which we consider

sider will elevate our fortunes has the effect of weakening their foundations.

Although M. Guizot carried into all the affairs with which he had to deal the same ardour which led good and mild men in former days to sanction the rack and to defend the Inquisition, we know of no other passage of his history in which the object he had in view was not a legitimate one, and the errors into which he fell were not the effects of his over-excited judgment counteracting his intentions.

He touches on the affairs of Rome and of Switzerland. To Rome he brought the best theories and the most impracticable projects. Every passion that prevails in Italy is to be extinguished in order that a system which he has invented, and which neither churchmen nor laymen were willing to adopt, should be established. He acknowledges at last that this was impossible except with the presence of a French army, which was to represent Italian interests and repress Italian feelings. Two practical men, M. Mazzini and M. de Metternich, tell him he is dreaming; but he persists in his illusions, and the final result of his efforts is the flight of Pius IX., whom his wish was to sustain, and the downfall and death of his friend M. de Rossi, whom he intended to make omnipotent: a state of complete confusion is the almost inevitable consequence of his plans for order. He did not comprehend men nor the passions of mankind. He looked on material beings as intellectual machines who could be governed by plausible theories and more or less skilful argumentation.

With respect to Switzerland, it would be without use, and without interest, to attempt to enter into the complicated questions concerning that country where, as M. Guizot said with some appositeness, '*Le sort de Loyola dépendait dans ce temps de la sagesse de Calvin.*' He discusses them, as it seems to us, with more than necessary minuteness, for a great deal of correspondence ends in no result; and when this distinguished memorialist says, at the end of his narrative, 'Qui se souvient et se soucie de M. d'Ochsenbein et de Sonderbund?' one is tempted to say, 'Why then have you said so much about them?'

But we arrive at last at the great catastrophe, and here M. Guizot's story is remarkably *picturesque*, and will ever be historical. The two most remarkable facts in his career are that no one was more thoroughly impressed with the advantages of the English alliance to France, nor more deeply conscious of the benefits to be derived from constitutional government in France, than himself. Yet no one did more to destroy both. This was caused

caused by his ardour concentrating his intellect into a focus, which became not light but fire.

He had, as we have said at an earlier portion of this article, taken as his theory of government the doctrine of resistance. He acknowledged however, that, to resist, it was necessary for a ministry to have a majority in the representative chamber; but he never recognised the yet more important fact that the representative chamber should really represent the nation. With a great deal of adroitness, and a firm and unbending determination, he strained all the resources of a centralised administration to procure that majority which he regarded as the backbone of his power. But this backbone was not of bone, but of pasteboard. The majority in the chamber ended by being a small minority in the nation.

Louis Philippe's authority was the authority and support of the middle classes; and as Paris (politically) is France, so the feelings of the middle classes in Paris presented a fair means of judging of the feelings of the middle classes generally throughout the French kingdom. At the commencement of Louis Philippe's reign, all the deputies of Paris supported his government: then the majority: then the minority: then Paris did not return any deputy who was not of the opposition, and lastly the National Guard became disaffected. These were symptoms which should have made the monarch and his minister diffident when their majority in the chamber made them confident.

The schism, indeed, between the country and the body which was supposed to represent it grew so glaring, that a cry for Parliamentary reform was the inevitable consequence. The reform desired by those who meant to maintain the Orleans dynasty was very simple: a lower, though still a very high qualification for an elector, and an elimination of certain categories of placemen from the elected. This class of reformers merely demanded the conversion of a fictitious chamber into a real one, which would still rest on a moderate monarchical basis. The republicans who joined the monarchical reformers went no doubt much further, but their influence at the commencement of this crisis wholly depended on having the monarchists at their head. The following of both was of course all who wanted change and disorder. What rendered this incoherent band more imposing, was perhaps its very diversity. What rendered it dangerous, was the nature of the individual against whom it was arrayed. Some moderate concessions would have satisfied the dynastic opposition, who, in detaching themselves from their confederates, would have made an approaching attempt at revolution apparent, and

and rallied round the throne every shade of monarchical opinions.

The King's choice of another Ministry would equally have succeeded, and the opposition of any extreme Conservatives would have restored the Sovereign his popularity. M. de Morny with the courage and sagacity of a man of the world, when the cloud was merely in the air and the first murmurs of the approaching storm were only indistinctly heard, goes to M. Guizot and urges him to conjure the tempest. M. Guizot's reply was—his system: 'I think little,' he said, 'of these demands made upon us. They are demands we might grant without the slightest apprehension, but the voice of the population demands them, and not that of the Legislative assembly.' The man of the world thought this an argument in their favour; the man of the school thought differently. The Chambers opened, the Government threw down its steel gauntlet. The monarchical opposition took it up with a silken glove. Its amendment was thus worded:—

'Au milieu des manifestations diverses votre gouvernement saura reconnaître les vœux réels et légitimes du pays. Il prendra, nous l'espérons, l'initiative des réformes sages et modérées que réclame l'opinion publique, et parmi lesquelles il faut placer d'abord la réforme parlementaire. Dans une grande monarchie constitutionnelle, l'union des grands pouvoirs de l'état permet de suivre sans danger une politique de progrès, et de satisfaire à tous les intérêts moraux et matériels du pays.'

But the imperious Doctrinaire frowned defiance. He would resist as long as he had his rotten majority at his back. It proved to be 222 to 180: with it and the most able men of France and nearly all the French people against him, he determined to stand his ground. At this moment and previously, it would appear that he had different conversations with the King; but he had by his Spanish marriage put the citizen-monarch on the pedestal of Louis XIV. Concessions to subjects would weaken his authority with European potentates. He could not so humiliate himself. Dignity, however, was not the strong point in his character. If it had been so, he would have played the part he now assumed better. It was M. Guizot who threw the robe of dignity upon him. This statesman with his imperious manner, his confident assertions, his clear and sharply-chiselled sentences, drove, in fact, all the irresolutions of His Majesty out of the field before he could marshal them in order. A new question now appeared in the horizon: a series of reform banquets *à l'Anglaise* had been for some time taking place throughout France. They had undoubtedly, to a certain degree, excited

excited the public mind; but they had led to no tumult. . monster reform banquet, however, was at this time advertis at Paris. All reformers, all republicans, all revolutionists, we to attend this banquet. Frenchmen have little confidence in t quiet likely to attend any great public meeting in the heart their metropolis. The Government had no confidence that would be able to maintain the public peace; that portion of t opposition which did not want disorder, had no great faith its own ability to preserve order.

The Government at last determined on preventing the banqu But a new question here intervened: Had it the legal power doing so? On this the greatest legal authorities were divid A few gentlemen of the moderate opposition and of the cons vative party devised a scheme which was, as the English wou say, particularly French. There was to be a sort of theatri representation of the reformers at their banquet and the police their post. A sort of commission drew out a plan, according which the deputies were to take their places. The police w then to tell them to go about their business. M. Odilon Bar on this was to make a short speech or protest, referring the mat to a judicial tribunal, and the party were to separate and to to bed. Of course this play was damned before it came on t stage.

The constitutional opposition then withdrew their supp from the banquet, which was abandoned; but in order not forfeit their popularity, which had been declining as the violen of the public increased, they brought an accusation of treas against the Cabinet.

The legal opposition was now in the Chamber, but the illeg one was in the streets. It assembled in the lower kind of caf it paraded the public promenades in groups. Rebellion had r begun, but there could be little doubt that it was beginning; a the National Guard, in the balanced condition of parties a amidst the excitement everywhere existing in Paris, seemed lit disposed to act. King Louis Philippe was at last seriou alarmed. He had been playing, as we have said, a grand p that was not natural to him; he now longed to shove his ar ficial dignity into a corner and rely on his own real weapon dexterity, which, if he had employed it earlier, would probab have brought him off victorious.

We are to fancy M. Guizot wrapped up in his self-confiden on his accustomed bench, surrounded by his satellites, the pri of responsibility and peril enhancing the expression of his rig and handsome countenance, when M. Duchatel, who had ju come from the Tuileries, summons him from the Chamb

Wh

What has M. Duchatel come to say? The monarch means doubtless to encourage his faithful servant, and to tell him to stand firm by the policy they had formed and resolved to maintain together. Alas! no. M. Duchatel comes to say that the Queen, in the presence of the King, had said to him, 'Je connais le dévouement de M. Guizot pour le Roi et pour le France; s'il le consulte, il ne restera plus au pouvoir.' He is summoned to the palace. M. Guizot, we must do him the justice to say, is no wise startled. He mounts the steps of the Tuileries with an equal pace, he faces the Sovereign with an undaunted air. He has no fear; he is quite ready to do battle to the last extremity; but at the same time he has no wish to retain office against the King's desire. The King assures him 'of the pain with which he loses his services.' The words were said. M. Guizot receives them with the same severe calm with which a stoic would have received the required death-blow from his favourite slave, and returns to the Chamber to announce that his Majesty was going to form a Ministry with M. Molé.

M. Molé was not the man to have sent for at that moment. He represented precisely the same principles as M. Guizot, but with the graces of a popular manner. He would probably not have brought the State into these difficulties, but he was wholly unable to get it out of them. A few days earlier, M. Thiers, M. Odilon Barrot, and Marshal Soult might have sufficed to calm and impose on an irritated opposition; but the conflict in Parliament was now succeeded by the Revolution assuming a more and more threatening character in the streets. Conciliation without a victory was, perhaps, impossible: for a victory, M. Guizot and Marshal Bugeaud were the men. The King, as it appears to us, should never have kept M. Guizot so long as he did, and never have sent him away when he did. But it is almost the characteristic of irresolute sovereigns to follow violent men until they bring them into a danger, and then to dismiss them and to take weak ones who break down under a peril for which neither their nature nor their ideas ever prepared them.

Left to himself, when the iron staff he had so long been leaning on was taken from his hand, his Majesty Louis Philippe does not seem to have been able to take one resolute step. Even the military force was without an organised plan or a suitable commander. M. Molé's attempt to form a Cabinet failed. MM. Thiers and Odilon Barrot were then sent for, but in the mean time the insurrection spreads, and the King, after much hesitation, begs M. Guizot—who is still exercising the functions of Government—to place Marshal Bugeaud at the head of the troops. The

Duc de Nemours, M. Guizot, and M. Duchatel accompany the Marshal to his head-quarters. They stop at the Place du Carousel, where the troops were assembled. 'We asked the Marshal,' says M. Guizot, 'what he thought of the morrow': —

'Il est un peu tard,' dit-il; 'mais je n'ai jamais été battu, et je ne commencerai pas demain; qu'on me laisse faire, et tirer le canon. Il y aura du sang répandu, mais demain soir la force sera du côté de la loi, et les facteurs auront reçu leur compte.'

This group would form a suitable subject for an historical picture. The nomination of Marshal Bugeaud was the last act of the Ministry Guizot. M. Thiers and Odilon Barrot accepted the King's offer:—

'Je ne retournai aux Tuileries le lendemain, 24 Février, vers huit heures du matin, que pour prendre définitivement congé du Roi, que je ne revis plus qu'à Claremont.'

The most honourable part of M. Guizot's long and distinguished career is, perhaps, that which has passed since his exile from office. If he did not show himself equal to prosperity, he has certainly risen superior to adversity. Remaining in his native land, that land being agitated by successive changes, strong passions, and divided interests—living under a rule based upon principles directly opposite to his own—he has kept himself free from all intrigues, from all factions, and from all servility. His life has passed chiefly in a country residence, where he has exercised a becoming, inexpensive hospitality, occupying his leisure with literary pursuits, gathering round him an amiable and intellectual family, and when he casually appears at Paris, never failing to be surrounded by a small number of old and valued friends, who consider it a *fête* to draw him into their circle. There his noble and correct language, his great and varied acquirements, his long worldly experience, the interest he still takes in the present while lingering over the past, give to his conversation a charm which those who have ever experienced it cannot easily forget. Few men, if any, have had so enjoyable a repose after so agitated a life; for his is the repose of a self-satisfied mind. If he has committed many errors as a statesman, and we think he has, he does not see them. He sits on the ruins of Carthage as he would in a garden of flowers, and whilst recognising his misfortunes, observes, with a calm and contented smile, that he looks in vain for his faults.

Like many men who have played a great part on the world's great stage, his personal appearance is in harmony with his public

public reputation: slight and short in stature—which never loses from not being erect—simple in manner and attire, with features that seem intended for a bronze cast, and with an expression of countenance severe rather than stern,—proud and yet somewhat overcast—all who see his portrait may read in it 'a soul unshaken, and an empire lost.'

ART. V.—1. *Report of the Select Committee on the National Gallery.* 1853.
2. *Report on the National Gallery Site Commission.* 1857.
3. *Report from the Select Committee on the British Museum.* 1860.
4. *Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 7th March,* 1862.
5. *Return to two Orders of the House of Commons, dated 26th February, and 15th March,* 1864.
6. *On the Extent and Aims of a National Museum of Natural History.* By Professor Owen, F.R.S. London, 1862.
7. *Les Trois Musées de Londres. Par Henri de Triquéti.* 1861.
8. *Journal des Savants, Novembre,* 1866.

THERE is no more curious problem for the impartial observer, if such a faultless monster ever existed, than the practice and politics now connected with questions of art in this country. Nowhere is the liberty of the subject and of the brush more rapidly increasing and more anomalously developing. The overflowings of wealth and freedom, and, we must add, of their occasional concomitants, caprice and crotchets, form a strange conglomerate, which future generations, unless, as is very probable, more capricious and crotchety still than ourselves, may find it difficult to analyse. Our exhibitions illustrate in the fullest degree the old motto *de gustibus non est disputandum*; our journals as flatly contradict it by no end of disputes on that very topic; and our Legislature puzzles us more than either by acting or not acting on matters regarding the arts, which come under their jurisdiction, with an apparent eccentricity which fairly takes us—the stupid outside public—by surprise. In many ways we proudly announce to the world at large that we are free, rich, and strong. In many ways also we are pleased to show that we are a generous and patriotic people, and in no respect more unmistakably so than in this very much abused province of the Arts. In no country are such munificent presents and bequests poured from the hands of private individuals into the vast lap of the nation. No museums and galleries are so largely composed,

not only of gratuitous, but, what does not always follow, of truly valuable contributions. Against the number of *chefs-d'œuvre*, in the way of pictures only, which have been presented to the different public museums of London, the gallery of the Louvre has literally but one paltry donation to cite, though by a once great personage, and that a poor example of a poor master.* Nor can any Government now compare with our own in the intelligence of its views and the liberality of its grants in the search for and acquisition of objects of art. At the same time we are bound to confess that in no respect do we so wantonly expose ourselves to the charge of ignorance, caprice, inconsistency, and even niggardliness, as in those parliamentary debates which relate to the preservation, accommodation, and locating of our public collections, the value of which is beyond money estimate.

It is now beginning to be admitted that, as respects what must be considered the first thing needful, viz., the discovering, selecting, obtaining, and carrying off the choicest and most important works of art, of all classes and in all lands, our country, thanks to her Government and to her public servants, stands foremost among the nations of Europe. The tables are now turned since we were always harping on the old string of our backwardness, and ignorance, and poverty in these respects, as compared with the superior enlightenment and treasures of other nations. Indeed that string now begins to be harped upon to our laudation by the very foreigners with whom we were wont to be so disparagingly compared, but who now see themselves outstript in that race of intelligent competition which requires not only a free-handed public, but a Government uninfluenced by extraneous and ulterior views, to properly sustain. French national vanity is supposed to have been gratified by the ostentatious purchase of a Murillo, for at least six times its present highest market value—a picture which the best judges of art would with great equanimity have seen banished to the hermitage at St. Petersburg; and French politics were intended to be quietly served by the acquisition, at an insane price, of the overgrown and very unequal contents of the Campana collection. But the enlightened judges among our neighbours—and nowhere is that class more extended and honourable—were equally alive with ourselves to the real nature and motives for these purchases, and, unhappily for themselves, much more alive to the humiliating inferences to be drawn from them. Nothing has annoyed the French connoisseur more than that a pretended zeal for art should be made the pretext

* No. 281. *Jan Matsys.* David and Bathsheba. 'Ce tableau, qui faisait partie de la collection de M. le Comte de Morny, fut donné par lui au Musée en Mai, 1852.'—*Catalogue of the Louvre.* 1854.

for

for inundating the Louvre with a collection, much of which every real lover of art is anxious to repudiate. But to return to ourselves. Such a work as 'Les Trois Musées de Londres,' by M. de Triquéti, a gentleman and connoisseur almost as well known in London as in Paris, was intended to open the eyes of his compatriots both to the rapidly-increasing importance of our public collections and to the single-eyed manner in which they are obtained; and it may not unfairly be used to assist our own vision as well:

> 'Oh that some Power the gift would gie us,
> To see ourselves as others see us,'

may be quoted in two ways.

We are not so accustomed to hear ourselves praised by foreigners as to doubt the sincerity of M. de Triquéti's sentiments in speaking of our art-institutions:—

'En peu de temps ces musées deviendront les premiers du monde. L'importance de chacun d'eux s'accroît d'année en année, grâce aux ressources considérables que le Parlement leur accorde, grâce surtout aux dons nombreux et aux legs importants que le zèle des conservateurs ne se lasse pas d'encourager,* et que la générosité des donateurs ne se lasse pas de fournir. Il est donc facile de prévoir que d'ici à peu d'années les chefs-d'œuvre, aujourd'hui en petit nombre, qui ne font point partie des galeries publiques de l'Europe, surveillés et sollicités avec une vigilance qui ne s'endort jamais, viendront grossir les trésors de l'Angleterre, et lorsque les autres nations, qui se reposent sur l'idée trop avantageuse de leurs richesses, voudront compléter leurs collections, il sera trop tard.'—p. 5.

Nor need we insult M. de Triquéti's known sincerity and judgment by extending to him an accusation brought against another learned writer upon our collections of art, namely, of a partiality for the English so blind as to extend even to every object in an Englishman's possession; on the contrary, we may pocket both the praise of our galleries and the partiality for ourselves with additional thankfulness for the perfect sincerity of each. For even had Dr. Waagen and M. de Triquéti held their peace, there is plenty of evidence to the same effect making itself heard among foreign writers, guiltless, we believe, of any crime

* In alluding to the encouragement bestowed by the heads of Museums and curators of departments on those who propose to give or bequeath to the nation, M. de Triquéti probably remembered the very opposite modes of proceeding on the part of the 'Département du Louvre.' The sale of the late M. de Beaucousin's fine collection of pictures to our National Gallery, was, we are assured, simply owing to his vexation at the indifference and discourtesy with which his proposal to bequeath them to the Louvre had been received by the authorities of that Gallery.

of

of personal predilection for us as a nation. The 'Journal des Savants' of November, 1866, in an article by M. Beulé, 'Les Découvertes Archæologiques de M. Newton,' gives utterance to its feeling in a manner which, oscillating as we incomprehensible Englishmen always do between the extremes of self-love and self-depreciation, is good for us occasionally to hear:—

'Le monde entier sait avec quelle prodigieuse rapidité le British Museum s'est enrichi de marbres et de sculptures antiques depuis un demi-siècle: mais ce qu'il faut admirer, et ce qui devrait servir de modèle à des pays qui prétendent aimer les arts, c'est la persévérance des Anglais, c'est la continuité de leurs sacrifices, c'est leur vigilance qui ne laisse échapper aucune occasion, c'est l'intervention toujours prête du gouvernement, qui donne des instructions à ses agents dans les terres classiques, leur envoie de l'argent, des hommes, des navires, les soutient avec énergie contre le mauvais vouloir ou l'indolence des Orientaux, et provoque par cette intelligente politique les plus importantes découvertes. M. Layard, revient-il d'un voyage en Asie, parle-t-il des magnifiques découvertes du Consul de France à Mossoul, on lui donne aussitôt les moyens de fouiller un autre monticule, et de partager avec M. Botta les dépouilles de Ninive. M. Rawlinson, publie-t-il, en 1850, sa dissertation sur *les Inscriptions de l'Assyrie et de la Babylonie*, on le nomme, la même année, consul-général à Bagdad, afin qu'il poursuive les recherches de M. Layard. M. Charles Fellowes, décrit-il les monuments de la Lycie, en désignant ceux qu'il serait facile d'enlever, il trouve aussitôt les ressources et l'appui nécessaires pour exécuter cette entreprise et former cette salle si originale et si instructive des sculptures lyciennes. Enfin, le système inauguré par Lord Elgin est pratiqué avec une sorte de régularité par l'Angleterre: ce qui jadis a soulevé tant d'indignations est cité aujourd'hui sans envie et avec éloges, d'abord parce que l'on est convaincu qu'il faut arracher les chefs-d'œuvre antiques à l'incurie barbare des Musulmans, ensuite parce que ces chefs-d'œuvre étaient, pour la plupart, enfouis sous le sol, et parce qu'ils sont la propriété légitime de ceux qui les découvrent. La science profite surtout de ces pacifiques conquêtes, et ses applaudissements font taire les rivalités nationales.'—p. 1.

But it is not only the fact of the acquisitions, and of the practical and honourable modes in which they are conducted, which excite the envy of our neighbours, their attention is also drawn to the superior facilities which the British public command in the enjoyment of them; to the comparative ease with which the most valuable or out of the way object is opened to an inquirer; to the boundless courtesy with which not only the thing desired, but also the intelligence and knowledge of the curator on the subject, is placed at the service of the humblest student.

On this head M. de Triquéti warmly expresses the feelings of many

many foreigners with whom we have conversed, who cannot sufficiently testify their astonishment at the courtesy and assistance which an absolutely unrecommended stranger receives at the British Museum, concluding with this somewhat despairing invocation on behalf of our curators: 'Puissent-ils trouver en France, lorsqu'ils y viennent, une bienveillance et une politesse égales à celles qu'ils m'ont témoignées.'

Heartily do we endorse this wish, though in somewhat of the same despairing tone, for too well do we know the difficulties, delays, and general obstructions, active and passive, which meet a foreigner, and, to do them justice, a native no less than a foreigner, on the threshold of the Bibliothèque Impériale, the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, and most Continental libraries, and which accompany him throughout his much-impeded quest even for the commonest objects in their keeping. One particularly qualified to know how such matters are conducted abroad and at home—Mr. Panizzi, late Principal Librarian to our British Museum—has left a pithy morsel of evidence on record: 'It happens in foreign libraries, when they want to save themselves trouble, that if you ask for a particular book, they will say they have not got it.'* According to our experience they always want to save themselves trouble.

But to return to our particular subject. If the acquisition of such treasures as our British Museum contains be the first thing needful for the formation of a great institution, there is a second thing quite as needful in its turn—and that is the appropriately housing and properly exhibiting them.

It is now nearly ten years ago since we called the attention of the readers of this Journal† to the straitened and embarrassing position of the British Museum as regards the accommodation or even safe storing of the treasures belonging to the nation committed to its keeping. During this interval the urgency for more space may be said to have increased tenfold, while the resistance of Parliament—for to its indecision and inconsistency no other term can be applied—may be said to have increased in the same ratio with the pressure vainly brought to bear upon it. More than ten years ago, according to the Reports issued, the antiquities—under which name the sculptures, inscribed monuments, and monuments of handicraft, of Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, are included—wanted double their allotted space, the Ethnography four times its space, the Natural History we dare not say how much. Ten years ago the Etruscan antiquities, the

* 'Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the British Museum. 1860.' Answer 3551.

† July Number, 1858. Article VII.

Phœnician

Phœnician antiquities and inscriptions, the Byzantine, Oriental, Mexican, and Peruvian antiquities, the sculptures from Persepolis, the Sinaitic inscriptions, the large collection of tessellated pavements from Carthage and Halicarnassus, amounting to many hundred square feet, and the ancient, most pathetically interesting sepulchral monuments, were all down in what is politely called the basement story; corresponding, we may observe, to what are believed to be the cellars in other houses; not open to the public, and scarcely visible when opened to any special inquirer. Ten years ago the temple-tomb of Mausolus, one of the ancient seven wonders of the world, hid its beautiful but battered remains beneath the shabby sheds erected under the portico; the collection of Greek inscriptions—which is of a class surpassing that in any Continental Museum—having been turned into the cellars in order to give Mausolus even this sorry accommodation. Ten years ago the osteological specimens in which we stand unrivalled in the scientific world,* comprising the skull of the great Greenland Mysticete Whale, which, as soon as peace was restored in 1815, Cuvier came over to England on purpose to examine, were all packed up in boxes, and these boxes lying in the darkest part of the underground story. Ten years ago large specimens of mammalia ceased to be purchased from want of room, and presents of them were declined for the same reason. Ten years ago not a tenth of the fish were exhibited, and not a fifth of the skins of reptiles were stuffed. Ten years ago the papyri were hanging upon the stairs, and there they hang still. In none of these instances, in short, has there been the slightest change for the better, but rather infinitely for the worse, from the number of additions which have accrued since, as we shall have occasion to note. From all alike the same hungry cry still goes forth—the printed books, the most hungry of all at one time, but now rejoicing in their land of Goshen, being the only class which at present mercifully hold their tongues.

But our readers will remind us that these sorely hampered objects to which we have alluded are all more or less large and cumbrous, and requiring much floor or wall space; but what of the smaller classes? One can imagine some embarrassment in appropriately lodging whole temples, gigantic capitals, Rha-

* Such is the importance of this collection in the eyes of learned foreigners, that M. Gervais, before consenting to continue the late M. Blainville's 'Ostéologie,' came to England purposely to ascertain whether there would be any impediment to his examining it; observing that, if there were, it would be impossible for him, in justice to the subscribers, to undertake the work; the skeletons in the British Museum being better determined, and the species more numerous, than in any other collection. This was as long ago as 1851. See Return to Order of House of Commons, 22nd June, 1852.

meses

meses heads, and even a large number of life-sized statues; but surely prints and drawings can be arranged in any spare room! Mastodons, elephants, rhinoceroses, and *hoc genus omne* must necessarily cover roods of ground; but where can be the necessity of squeezing up tiny coins and medals? Ethnography, with its canoes and paddles, hideous idols and stuffed Esquimaux, spreads over a quantity of space, which, from various intimations in the Reports, we perceive to be more grudged than any other; but surely insects can be put anywhere! Alas! dear reader, 'anywhere' is a place which has been used up over and over again in the British Museum. It is precisely these little people who bear witness to the extremity to which the whole Institution is reduced; where the siege is so strait that the rats and mice are starved, we know how it fares with the larger inhabitants. As regards these classes of diminutive objects they cannot be said to be exhibited at all. They are kept in custody, and nothing more; and even that with great difficulty and inconvenience. Of the insects we perceive that only three drawers out of six hundred are seen by the public. As to the coins and medals, they might as well, liberal as private individuals now are, be in a private house. If particularly asked for, presupposing a visitor to have found his way to so distant a region, they are most courteously shown; but the public, as such, may pass through all the open rooms in the Institution without suspecting that such things exist. The same may be said of the prints and drawings, which, with the exception of a few of the former displayed on ill-lighted screens in the Royal Library, are entirely and necessarily hidden from the public eye. Under these circumstances it is almost amusing to trace the jealous arguments on behalf of the public, recorded in evidence before Select Committees, for keeping everything within the precincts of the Museum, while all the while a very large portion of its contents are, and have been for years, as much withdrawn from the purpose for which they were put there, as if they had never been put there at all.

And now having, as we hope, convinced our readers that what we have termed 'the second thing needful,' where great collections are concerned, was more than ten years ago terribly in arrear, we will favour them with a brief abstract of the trifling additions which, according to the annual Reports have somehow or other been stowed away, during that interval, in the vast hold of our ill-used National Craft. For the British Museum may be but too truly compared to a goodly ship, which after being laden full to bursting, sees her decks so encumbered with superabundant

abundant cargo as not to leave room for her crew to work or her officers to navigate.

In the following abstract we omit the department of printed books, which, as is well known, have still ample space in hand—only observing that Mr. Panizzi's anticipations of additions ranging from 30,000 to 35,000 volumes a year have been fully realised.

Nor do the Reports furnish any available census of the amount of antiquities which have arrived during the last ten years; which might indeed be better reckoned by cases than by pieces. For, including, as this category does, all forms of art and archæology, Egyptian, Assyrian, Oriental, Greek, Roman, mediæval—with gems, gold ornaments, &c., and last, though never least, the department of Ethnography—it defies all purposes of numerical computation, and may be classed by hundreds of thousands of objects. The following abstract of the number of specimens added to other departments has been gleaned from the reports of the last ten financial years—from 1857 to 1866, both years inclusive:—

	Manuscripts.	Coins and Medals.	Zoology.	Geology.	Prints and Drawings.	Minerals.
1857	1,303	1,049	48,044	9,880	4,107	..
1858	478	1,250	42,691	6,020	3,553	..
1859	1,834	10,083	33,307	2,608	1,057	3,186
1860	971	1,385	25,222	4,055	3,571	10,000
1861	459	2,049	16,121	5,432	8,803	1,525
1862	1,302	1,858	13,129	1,842	4,683	1,200
1863	578	826	98,754	3,053	5,697	667
1864	751	2,567	7,688	4,651	4,144	634
1865	1,625	927	16,700	10,079	6,693	3,623
1866	1,019	11,532	92,018	4,061	4,256	672
	10,320	33,526	393,674	51,681	46,564	21,507

Of the specimens of botany we have been able to gather no numeration.

Nor will we trust only to the eloquence of numbers—the quality of these additions is to the full as surprising as their quantity. A glance at a few of the most remarkable in some of the departments will suffice. For example, under the head of antiquities, stand forth the sculptures from Cnidus and Branchidæ, obtained for the nation by the exertions of Mr. Newton; the Greek and Greco-Phœnician antiquities, vases, gold ornaments, &c., dug up at Camirus in the island of Rhodes, by MM. Salzmann and Biliotti; the sculptures discovered at Cyrene by

by Captains Smith and Porcher; the collection of vases found in Sicilian tombs by Mr. Dennis, and presented by Earl Russell; the Cyrenaic vases also found by Mr. Dennis; the beautiful bronze lamp discovered in Paris; the numerous purchases of sculptures, bronzes, and vases at the Pourtalés sale; the matchless objects, each a *chef-d'œuvre* in its way, obtained from Signor Castellani; the inscriptions and sculptures discovered at Ephesus by Mr. Wood; the terra cottas presented by Mr. Consul Colnaghi from Cyprus; and last, but not least, the antiquities, gems and ornaments, from the Blacas Collection.

Then, in the department of coins and medals, we find the English medals collected by Mr. Hawkins; a selection of rare Greek coins from Lord Northwick's sale; the valuable donation of Roman and Swiss coins by Mr. John de Salis;* another, no less important, of Roman gold coins, presented by Mr. Wigan, valued at 3200*l.*; a collection of Greek and other coins, 7700 in number, deposited by the Bank of England; and the coins and medals of the Blacas Collection.

Under the head of Ethnography and Geology appear the remarkable collection of pre-historic man and mammalia, with implements found in the limestone caverns near Bruniguel, South of France, by Vicomte de Lastic; the Sowerby collection of fossil shells; Mr. John Gray's fossils; the Solenhofen fossils from the lithographic limestone quarries near Pappenheim; and the important ethnographical collection bequeathed by the late Mr. Christy, chiefly rich in early remains from the Drift, but, from want of space, retained at his former house in Victoria Street, for which the British Museum pays rent.

In the department of mineralogy we may call attention to Col. Kokscharow's collection, principally of Russian, and particularly of Siberian minerals, including the suite of magnificent topazes and other precious stones. Also a crystal from Iceland, the largest known, weighing about 3 cwt.; with valuable additions to meteoric stones.

As to the department of Zoology, the number of remarkable acquisitions are beyond specification. 'Continued hope in the ultimate acquisition of adequate space has supported endeavours to secure every attainable specimen' that could find place anywhere, in or out of the sight of the public. One isolated object we must, however, instance, viz., the bones of the Dodo, from

* Besides presenting this magnificent collection of coins, by which a grave deficiency in our numismatic sequence has been supplied, Mr. de Salis has conferred on the public the further benefit of his personal learning and services by officiating as an honorary curator, in which capacity he regularly attends the Museum, and has contributed suggestions of no small value to those interested in this class of antiquities.

the

the Mauritius, a bird only extinct two centuries ago, and yet now affording such rare and fragmentary remains, that a single dried foot has been, since the time of Sir Hans Sloane, a principal zoological wonder in the museum he founded. This is a warning to us not to despise specimens of some of our common but fast diminishing animals. These bones establish the authenticity and correctness of an old life-sized representation of the dodo, 'drawn in Holland from the living bird, brought from St. Maurice's Island,' an object which is one of the earliest presentations to our great Institution.

Nor can we omit Mr. Cuming's unrivalled collections, principally of shells, the accumulations of a life of indefatigable zeal, spent in voyages in the North and South Pacific, in a vessel freighted by himself for the express purpose of obtaining objects of natural history, the greater portion of which are pronounced to be 'new to science.' These collections, at Mr. Cuming's death, were obtained upon the moderate terms specified, for the benefit of the British Museum, in his will. Such passages as this in the history of a museum make us proud of some of our countrymen, though the more ashamed of others.

With these figures before us, with these proofs of the highest intelligence in research, with these traits of generosity and patriotism, we are tempted to ask ourselves, our readers, the public—any one who will answer—what is the possible meaning of the indifference of the powers that be to those conditions which follow as a matter of course on such premises? The additions of the last ten years alone would make a museum such as any State might be proud of. Do our representatives intend that our noble Institution should expire at last of sheer repletion? Year by year money for fresh purchases is granted, with a perseverance only equalled by that with which the space necessary for them is refused. At this very time treaties for fresh collections or remarkable objects are going on all over the world. At this very time Mr. Wood is making excavations in the Theatre and on the Sacred Way at Ephesus;—Mr. Dennis is on a roving commission in Asia Minor, with special reference to the Greek cities on the Western coast. Soon the fruits of their labours, sixty cases at a time, will be appearing; soon foreigners will be again envying our good fortune and liberal Government in getting that which we are not allowed room even to unpack! What would be said of a Paterfamilias who went on annually increasing his family, providing them the best possible nurses, and yet grudging them a nursery, till the poor children were jammed together in a manner inviting the interference of the Lodging House Act? The wisest of lawgivers are, we know, but

but mortal men, and as such, privileged to be inconsistent; but our lawgivers will be satisfied with nothing short of a sublimity of inconsistency which, begging their pardons, if it were not so disgraceful, would be ridiculous: *Qualis ab incepto processerit, ut sibi constet.*

Hitherto we have invoked the sympathy of our readers for stocks and stones; now we must say something of the sufferings of the staff. These annual Reports to which we have referred,—a very *pot pourri* of all that can interest an intelligent mind,—are also the channel for periodical groans from heads of departments. It is impossible, indeed, to avoid a certain sense of the serio-comic as we look through the grave details of worries, perplexities, and impotent indignations, which are laid bare for our perusal, all turning on the fact that the want of space impedes the officers of the Museum in what they hold higher than comfort, honour, or profit, namely, the performance of their duty. Of course, with the increase of every collection, a larger number of assistants is required; and yet, from the very circumstances of the case, less and less possible to accommodate where they already tread on each other's heels. Sir Frederick Madden, late keeper of the Manuscript department, curiously illustrates this conflict between the indispensable and the impossible. Smarting under a sense of disrespect, not so much for himself as to his charge, increasing, as we have seen, at the rate of a thousand manuscripts a year, he vehemently demands the appointment of six more assistants; while, in the same breath, he naïvely confesses that, if appointed, he should not know where to place them. And seeing that the only space for junior officers, readers, artists, and attendants is but 30 feet by 23 feet—so crowded with presses, tables, desks, chairs, &c., as hardly to leave a way through to the chief officer's own study, and that this pen is but a portion of a larger room, separated off by a low screen—in short, one of the many makeshifts—considering all this, there can be no doubt that Sir Frederick's second thoughts were the wisest.

The very trades of the Museum partake of the general distress. We will give an instance. Where books and readers augment so fast, the bookbinders must augment in the same ratio. The number of these useful auxiliaries amounts to above 120, and their services and their materials cost the nation 7000*l.* a year. The only thing wanted is that which can be least dispensed with, viz., workshops proportioned to the workers. Even such as they had outgrown were taken from them for some more pressing need—for inscriptions, or bones, or bottles with specimens, which the public never see—till the trustees were driven

to

to the high treason of sanctioning the abstraction of books from the building, and allowing them to be repaired in a house hired for the purpose opposite the Museum.

So searching has been the demand for additional accommodation, no matter where—the coal-cellar even, we believe, has been invaded,—*multa docet fames*—that covetous eyes have been cast on every hole and corner. In 1862 the authorities grew suddenly so patriotic as to desire to dispense with the military guard. 'Soldiers,' they remark,* 'might be more usefully employed than in being kept for mere show at the Museum.' But it was for love of their room that the Trustees were willing to forego their company. How matters stand now we know not, but the former guard-room, an erection fortunately detached from the Museum on the east side, was made over to the bookbinders, who in a very short time burnt it over their own heads.

And this reminds us that an officer, more important than any for the safety of the building, namely, the fireman, is, for lack of space, lodged in a temporary shed (in the same category with Mausolus),—though even in that respect better off than his assistant, who cannot be lodged at all. 'The attention of your committee has been drawn to the fact that the assistant fireman does not live upon the premises, there being no possible means of finding any accommodation for him at present, and that Captain Shaw, the superintendent of the fire brigade, has represented to the Trustees the importance of the fireman and his assistant being always at hand.' †

Nor, till very lately, did the principal person responsible for the warming apparatus (*absit omen!*) live at the Museum, for the same well-known reason, 'an officer who, in the opinion of the Trustees, should be always on the spot.' ‡

These may sound comparative trifles in illustrating the shifts to which the apathy of our representatives has driven a great national trust, but they are trifles on which important results attend. Should the great enemy of public buildings ever invade the sacred precincts of the British Museum, the cause will be probably more assignable to the absence of firemaker and fireman than to any other.

Our readers may wish now to know what has been done at all for the relief of the Museum since the pressure for space first began to make itself felt; during which time as much has been spent in committees, reports, and stationery, as would have gone some way in alleviating the evil. And here we are met by the indisputable fact that sculpture has been, upon the whole, the

* Return to Order of House of Commons, 7th March, 1862.
† Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

sturdiest

sturdiest suppliant that has presented itself at the doors of the Institution. The outpourings of Assyrian research, especially, discomfited every petty contrivance, and opened, like a resistless lever, not only space for itself, but for collections both of earlier and later date. It was owing, it appears, to the invasion of those mighty, human-headed, bird-winged, cinqueped lions and bulls—the strangest monsters that superstition ever made familiar and art grand—that Egypt was enabled to stretch her massive fragments more at ease, and Greece to do better justice to a perfection of forms and composition which nothing short of absolute annihilation could conceal. Between 1852 and 1859 the building of an additional Elgin-room, and of what is called the Græco-Roman gallery, made way for the huge monuments from Nineveh, and ceded to Egypt the whole length of Sir Robert Smirke's gallery. To the larger Assyrian slabs was devoted a long, open space, once outside the west wall of the Egyptian saloon, which had been converted by means of low skylights into two side galleries. One of these galleries, it is true, had been destined to gladden the heart of the late Mr. Carpenter, by affording his long sued for accommodation for engravings; but the stronger race prevailed over the weaker, and Marc Antonios and Albert Durers ceded the walls to the grand and mysterious storied sculpture of the period of Hezekiah. What is called the Assyrian basement room, which gives sorry lodging to the smaller, more delicate, and still more beautiful slabs from the palaces of Sennacherib and Sardanapalus, does not appear to have been completed till 1861. Before this time, however, the tide of extension had dried up, and when the monuments from Halicarnassus and Cnidus knocked at the door in 1857, no device for housing them was left except by the erection of those casual wards for itinerant sculpture outside the building, which still proclaim to the world at large our national bankruptcy. That our fathers should have for long afforded the Elgin marbles no better reception than that of an outhouse, is now excused on the score of the ignorance which at first pronounced them to be only Roman works of the time of Hadrian; but that their sons, who babble of art, and exhibitions, and diffusion of knowledge, should repeat the offence, and on a much more monstrous scale, is a mystery which our glorious constitution can alone solve.

Nothing shows more strikingly the vast and rapid increase of the collection of Antiquities than the fact that the Trustees have found it necessary to divide this department into several, and to appoint a special officer over each. Ten years ago the whole collection of Antiquities was under the superintendence of a single Keeper; but in 1861 they were divided into three separate departments,—

departments,—the 'Oriental,' the 'Classical,' and the 'Numismatical;' and in 1866 a further section, the 'Ethnographical,' was established, and placed under the care of a special curator. But it is generally admitted that even this division has not gone far enough, and that the Egyptian Antiquities alone are sufficient to occupy the time and attention of the accomplished Egyptologer who has now the charge of the Oriental section. It is probably want of space alone that has hitherto prevented the establishment of a 'Semitic' department, containing everything illustrative of Semitic religions, science, and art. Considering the vast importance which these studies are assuming at the present moment, the interest which the English people take in everything which illustrates the Bible, and the very rich collection of Semitic Antiquities which the Museum already possesses, there can be no doubt that they ought to be formed into a separate department under the special care of a competent Semitic scholar. The Museum possesses not only Assyrian remains sufficient in themselves to form a separate department, but also, closely connected with them, Babylonian and Persepolitan antiquities; Hebrew, Arabic, and Himyaritic inscriptions; specimens of Arab art; and last, but not least, the largest collection of monuments of Phœnician palæography extant. But if any one takes an interest in Phœnician archæology and wishes to see these remains, it is the same story over again. He will have first to descend into the dark vaults underneath the Assyrian sculptures for the purpose of examining the Phœnician sacrificial and votive tablets; he will then have to ascend into the uppermost regions for the purpose of inspecting the Phœnician coins; while he will have to hunt for the gems sometimes in the Classical and sometimes in the Egyptian department. The specimens of Arab art are found in the department of Ethnography, where they have to shift for themselves amidst Fiji clubs and grinning Mexican idols. Such a place is quite as appropriate as if the Nineveh bulls were sent to the department of Zoology, to take their place among the Bovidæ, and the fish-god Dagon were placed among the fossil fishes of the Geological section. Under these circumstances, we cannot regret that Mr. Cole has acquired for the South Kensington Museum the splendid Maymar collection of Arab art. Moreover, we may expect many valuable treasures from the researches of the Palestine Exploration Fund, which ought to find their appropriate place in our great national Museum; but, if offered, the Trustees could not receive them for want of space, and they will go, we suppose, to South Kensington. In fact, no archæological department would be more interesting to the great mass of the English people than one devoted

devoted to Semitic antiquities, provided sufficient space could be found for it, and a special Keeper were appointed, whose duty it would be to make it available to the public and increase it by fresh acquisitions. In any change we hope this important subject will not be lost sight of.

Meanwhile the books had been sturdy suppliants too—indefatigably backed by a champion whose remonstrances may be characterised rather as growls than groans. But at length our unjust judges, who were proof against any amount of importunity, gave way before a stroke of genius. In 1852 the idea of constructing the celebrated Reading-room was conceived by Mr. Panizzi; and about 1858 the building issued forth, full grown, from the brain of the British Museum Jupiter, armed at all points against criticism—the largest, best built, best lighted, best arranged, and really most beautiful apartment the world has yet seen. Moreover, the only structure erected in London, within the memory of man, which has escaped censure. But this afforded no alleviation to the other departments, but rather sharpened their hunger; for the small crumbs of space that the books could spare from their abundance, were soon swallowed up. Since the Reading-room cast its grand dome over the old courtyard, we are not aware of any additions, excepting those of the Refreshment-rooms in the basement—an appendage no longer to be deferred, when we consider that about an average of 400 persons attend the Reading-room daily; and these rooms, too, have been contrived at the usual expense of some other members of the unfortunate 'belly;' for the refreshments drove out the masons and other skilled workmen needed for the repairs of the sculptures, and they in their turn were transferred to the already over-filled sheds consecrated to Mausolus.

As to the natural history collections, beyond the favourite tactics of borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, which appear to have been exhausted upon them, it is difficult to trace that they have received help of any kind. It is almost amusing to hear Sir Roderick Murchison, with 'the glazed frameworks' staring him in the face, magnifying before the Committee of 1860 the accommodation granted to the sculpture, in order to place in stronger light the neglect shown to his more congenial departments. Professor Owen mentions as an ordinary annual occurrence, that, of 102,474 specimens added to the collections under his superintendence in 1863, not more than 5368 could by the utmost possible pains in adjustment be exhibited to the public.

But if the placing them at all be a difficulty, we are assured by the Reports that the finding them again when placed is a greater difficulty still.

Having endeavoured thus to give some idea of the much that is wanted and of the little that has been done, we will now complete the historical part of our case by briefly relating what it has been *proposed to do*. During the last thirty-two years there have been various Select Committees appointed to receive evidence, bearing directly or indirectly upon the subject of want of space in the British Museum. It will be sufficient for our purpose to glance at the three last, severally of 1853, 1857, and 1860.

The Select Committee of 1853 was on the National Gallery; one of its objects being to ascertain 'the expediency of combining the national collections of monumental antiquity and fine art in one building or group of buildings, under a single management;' in other words, the expediency of uniting the collections of Pagan sculpture in the British Museum, with that of the pictures by the old masters in the National Gallery; either by transferring the sculptures (those only of the best period of ancient art) to the National Gallery, or *vice versâ*. This proposition may be said to have settled itself; both British Museum and National Gallery being then already so overcrowded that no possible room could be afforded by either to the other. The Committee, therefore, after obtaining an immense amount of evidence, referred the question to another Royal Commission to decide.

The next Royal Commission (1857), called 'The National Gallery Site Commission,' was appointed 'to determine the site of the new National Gallery, and to report on the desirableness of combining with it the fine art and archæological collections in the British Museum.' The result of this portion of their deliberations is 'that it is not expedient to break up or to remove the collections of ancient art and archæology in the British Museum.' This was an important point gained.

The last Committee (1860) 'on the British Museum' was directed 'to inquire how far, and in what way, it may be desirable to find increased space for the extension and arrangement of the various collections in the British Museum, and the best means of rendering them available for the promotion of science and art.' This question was again divided under two heads: 1. 'Whether all the collections in the British Museum should be retained in their present locality; or whether any, and which of them, should be removed elsewhere?' 2. 'Whether space enough for all the collections can, with due regard to economy, be obtained in connexion with the British Museum?'

The Commissioners thus, for the first time, grappled with the two obvious and more than ever pressing alternatives—or rather they

they had the opportunity of grappling with them; for if their Report was entirely unsatisfactory, it was from no lack of the most convincing evidence.

As to the first point, they negatived the removal of the Natural History, on which the question of 'any, or which collections,' principally turned, on grounds which we think our readers will agree tell more strongly the other way. As to the second point, they declined to recommend the purchase of land and the erection of buildings in contiguity with the Museum sufficient for the present collections, and their gradual extension, which, under the circumstances, was the only course left open to them. At the same time they express 'the strongest hope that immediate action will follow their Report;' they call the attention of Parliament to the very thing to which Parliament had called theirs, namely, 'to the discreditable state of our great Museum;' and they conclude by quoting an incomprehensible letter 'from an eloquent Frenchman,' which, in style and purport, we should have thought the last kind of document to influence our matter-of-fact countrymen on any question whatever. To that letter we shall return.

That immediate action did not follow such a Report was not surprising. The untiring Trustees, however, did not let the grass grow under their feet. The time was come, they felt, for a stronger pressure than ever, and memorial after memorial was addressed to the Treasury, weighted with arguments for immediate measures of relief, among which the announcement of 'sixty-five cases of sculpture daily expected to arrive from the Cyrenaica,' told with peculiar force. After an interval of thirteen months, a Treasury Minute, 'on the subject of want of space in the Museum,' rewarded their patience. This minute is one of those admirable documents which occasionally console us for the evils attending certain public questions for which no one is responsible. It is in point of fact the true Report on the evidence given before the British Museum Committee; a document to which any reader desirous of forming his own judgment cannot do better than refer.* We shall gladly draw upon it in our remaining pages

In consistent action with the convictions expressed in this minute, the Government, in the Session of 1862, presented a Bill to Parliament 'to enable the Trustees to remove certain portions of their collections.' This Bill passed the House on the first reading, but was rejected on the second, mainly on the score 'of the large expense which would have to be incurred in erecting the necessary building for the natural history collections at Kensington.'

* Return to Order of House of Commons, dated 7th March, 1862.

On this result there is no occasion to reason. Fortunately it did not prevent the subsequent passing of a measure best calculated to neutralise what had gone before it. With that steady view into the probable future, which is the best part of statesmanship, the Government concluded negotiations with the Commissioners of the Exhibition of 1851 for a part of the Kensington estate, amounting to seventeen acres. Whether this was obtained for 5000*l.* or 10,000*l.* an acre, on which prospective point the Committee of 1860 had spent much bickering, does not now fortunately matter. The land is there, and this *fait accompli* narrows the whole vexed question.

As to the motives for, and the management of the proposal on the part of the Government in 1863 to purchase the flimsy and frightful buildings erected for the International Exhibition of 1862, the less now said the better. We hardly need assure our readers that they would have been utterly unfit for the reception of the Natural History collections. It is no wonder that the Bill which would have inflicted them upon Professor Owen and the public was thrown out with a warmth of indignation of which the only regrettable part was that it damaged the cause of the British Museum.

Since then (1863) the question has slumbered, and, except in the weekly increasing need, all things remain as they were.

There is no doubt that, at whatever inconvenience to the institution, this interval of inactivity has been beneficial, by giving time for prejudices, party feelings, and local and temporary jealousies to subside. Professor Owen's esteemed name has been made a battle cry by some, but, though more than ten years ago he pleaded in a well-known memorial for the retention of the Natural History in its present abode, this gentleman has but the better vindicated the fairness of his judgment by withdrawing his urgency on that point:—

'The locality of the Museum of Natural History has been made a party-question, and my name has been cited, both in and out of the House, as an advocate for or against this or that particular position. I never gave any grounds for such averments, having always considered sufficiency of space as paramount to any consideration of particular metropolitan position. But I have opposed in every legitimate way those who would sacrifice the advantages of space, even of the proportion most pressingly called for, to a continuance of the collections in the present building.' *

We may proceed, therefore, to state the merits of the case before a new jury, free, it is to be hoped, from bias for or against.

* 'A National Museum of Natural History,' by Professor Owen, F.R.S., p. 88.

The

The case is, as we all know, of a house of reception already too full for the health and comfort of its inmates, yet daily compelled to admit more and more. There are two obvious alternatives. Is the house to be increased to at least double its present size? Or are some of its inmates to be provided for elsewhere? There is, it is true, a third alternative, of a very cowardly kind, which is neither to mend the evil nor farther to increase it, namely, by interdicting any further admissions.

We take the question of adding to the house first. And here the point which presents itself immediately is, whether there is really any important end, either of national pride or public profit, answered by congregating under one roof every possible collection of science, nature, and art. The authority of 'an eloquent Frenchman,' quoted by the Select Committee of 1860 as decisive on the point, is one which, whatever the claims of M. de Verneuil to respect, is not calculated in this particular instance to win the convictions of those interested in this question. The nationality of this gentleman is ingeniously demonstrated by the introduction, in the course of a few lines, of two highly characteristic words, namely, 'idea' and 'glory.' What he intends us to understand, however, on this occasion, we leave our readers to find out. It would be a shame to bury eloquence, so irresistible in the eyes of the Select Committee, in a Blue-book; it is their translating, not ours:—

'The British Museum, as it now stands, is a monument unique in the world, which we envy you the possession of, and the preservation of which conceal (*sic*) at the same time your national glory and the science which we cultivate. To bring together in a single assemblage the productions of nature and the *chefs-d'œuvre* of art, to exhibit alongside of what God has made that which man can make; to associate the idea of the beautiful with that of the true, the world of our imagination with the real world, is doubtless a grand and noble conception, which should not be abandoned, and which, at any cost, I should wish to see completed.' *

That there is, however, no end answered by such 'a single assemblage,' nor any precedent for it, is, on the other hand, testified by many French names of, at least, equal eminence, and more especially in a letter to Mr. Panizzi from Count Laborde, one of the most distinguished scholars in Europe, and Keeper of the Archives of France; which letter is as eloquent as M. de Verneuil's and more intelligible:—

'As to the great gathering of the master-works of human genius and the productions of nature, that is an idea the theory of which was

* 'Report of Select Committee on the British Museum,' p. xxx.

first

first conceived in France, but which in practice presents many drawbacks. That, in a small town should be mixed, by reasons of economy, under the same roof and under the same superintendence, small collections, nothing is better; further on we shall have occasion to show the advantages of such an association of objects; but that, in a capital like London, an attempt should be made to stow away together, in the same building, however vast it may be, all its scientific and literary riches, is a puerile attempt. Suppose our Museums of the Louvre, of the Jardin des Plantes, of the School of Arts, of Artillery, of the Hôtel Cluny, of the Royal Library, united together, what building would suffice for such immense collections and its officers? Let us suppose that the country is rich enough to erect such a building, that the required site could be obtained in the city, we cannot doubt that in less than a couple of centuries these collections will be twice as large and as important, and how shall then provision be made for such an increase, except by building a town in a town? When collections have reached a certain extent and importance, instead of being united they ought to be more special and simplified. Some superficial minds may find it very advantageous to go from the marbles of Phidias to the manuscripts of the middle ages, from the works of nature to those of human genius; but for serious studies and for large investigations this fluttering here and there is of no use, and this union interferes with the natural development and the good management of the collections.' *

The Government, in the Minute before referred to, fully confirms this view. Their argument is

'Not whether a limited increase of accommodation shall once more be provided, but whether reason and convenience recommend or permit the continued union of the collections for an indefinite time, and that indefinite extension of the buildings which such union so prolonged must entail.

'The site of the Museum is, on the whole, admitted to have excellently served its purpose, but it seems difficult to find reasons for the opinions that in a city of 3,000,000 inhabitants, rapidly increasing, and stretching outwards from year to year, it can be for the convenience of the population that all the extended and multifarious collections represented in the main by the three names of the Library, the Natural History, and the Antiquities, should continue without limit of time to be concentrated and combined on a single spot.

'My Lords say without limit of time, because they feel that the question of separation, difficult as it is to settle now, will with the lapse of years become more and more embarrassing, and that its postponement now would be in practice its indefinite postponement.

'They are therefore of opinion that, apart from any question of expense, the principle of severance, if the time and mode be well chosen, is recommended by convenience.

* 'Report of Select Committee on British Museum,' 1860, p. 11.

'It

'It is, indeed, of great importance that any site which may be chosen for any part of the collections should be easily accessible.

'Were the internal communications of the metropolis in a stationary condition, it might be difficult to suggest a site of adequate capability as to extent, which should at the same time be equally accessible to the mass of the population as the British Museum. But, on the contrary, those communications are felt to be so imperfect as to require great efforts to be made for an increase of facilities, and it appears most probable that that increase will follow for the most part the direction of the leading through traffic.

'In these circumstances, it may happen that the spots which may be situated on those leading lines may be even more accessible, except to the narrow circle of the immediate neighbourhoods, than any spot not upon them, and thus, it is possible, than the Museum itself.' *

After this it is hardly necessary to urge other objections to an institution on so enormous a scale, such as the physical fatigue inseparable from the great distances to be traversed, and the congestion of mind, in the ordinary visitor, which accrues from too great a variety of claims upon his attention. We agree with Mr. Panizzi that 'the general public who visit such collections are bewildered by the quantity of objects which have nothing to do with each other,' and that such a combination induces, at best, but a barren excitement which is unprofitable to the visitor, and no compliment to the Museum. Further, it must be remembered that such vast accumulations become unmanageable, and cannot be thoroughly attended to. We may be told, perhaps, that the Louvre (though all its multifarious contents come under the category of art) is a standing example of the manageableness of an enormous and completely-filled building. But this is answered by a fact which strengthens our very argument, namely, that the collections of the Louvre are only accessible to the Paris public by turns—some being closed whilst others are open. Such an arrangement, however, would never do for England. We may be, or have been, famous for respecting laws, but we hate *regulations*. 'I think the public would be extremely dissatisfied, if, when they came to the Museum, they were told, you may go upstairs and look at the butterflies, but you must not go and look at the marbles.' † Better, therefore, two or more institutions open to the public every customary day, than one monster of which only half could be shown at a time.

We need not enter into any approximate calculations or details of expense. Everybody knows that the purchase of land to the extent of several acres in the heart of Bloomsbury, including the

* 'Return to Order of House of Commons,' 7th March, 1862, p. 5.
† Answer by Mr. Panizzi. 3604.

leases

leases of excellent dwelling-houses and the absorption of the site of whole streets and of part of a great square, must entail an enormous outlay; whether comparatively cheaper or dearer than a site of the same amount at South Kensington, is now fortunately past fighting about, since the completed purchase of the ground in that locality shuts that absurdly disputed question out of court. That those who have the control of public money should maturely weigh the question of expense, is their bounden duty; but in this case they are not invited to consider whether there should be any outlay at all, for they, as much as the public in general, know that the time for canvassing that question is long past. It is a very anomalous compromise meanwhile to insist upon ruining a nation's property under the notion of sparing the nation's purse. The question of expense is, therefore, only relative, when we start with the necessity that it must to some extent be incurred. There can be no doubt, however, that the purchase and clearance of several acres in so populous a quarter as that in contiguity to the Museum would exceed by a very large sum the value of a similar area and preparation at South Kensington. It has also to be taken into consideration that any buildings continuing the design and material of the British Museum must be erected at a great cost. No cheap, ornamental, and withal solid contrivances in terra-cotta, estimated at a shilling the square foot, as at Kensington—no modern application of iron, glass, and zinc—will serve in Bloomsbury.

And here we must remember that the question whether there should be emigration or not has been virtually set aside by the fact that emigration has taken place already. The binders and their books had to go across the way. Mr. Maskelyne, the keeper of the minerals, and his laboratory are located in a house in Great Russell Street. Mr. Christy's valuable collection is lodged bodily in a house in Victoria-street. Both in fact and in principle, therefore, the necessity of removing something is established. As regards the question which principal inmate should vacate, we must scan not any imaginary rival value—for in the eyes of the country all are valuable alike—but the relative benefit or loss in going or staying.

Assuming, therefore, that the 'glory' of combining under one roof, 'alongside of what God has made, all that man has made,' would, on consideration, be found illusory, and the 'idea' of extending the Museum interminably, ridiculous, the next question is, what portion of the present contents should be invited to emigrate? These contents may be divided into two kingdoms: the products of Nature and the works of Man. These again into three principal classes: the Library, the Natural History, and

and the Antiquities. Under the head of Natural History is comprised zoology, geology, mineralogy, and botany. Under that of Antiquities, the art and handicraft of all races and times —sculpture, inscribed monuments, vases, coins, medals, gems, mummies, manuscripts, prints, drawings, &c. &c. Ethnography, as the work of man in a state of nature, is a kind of hybrid which either party might claim, but which both are most amiably willing to give up. The Library belongs to both parties—to Nature and to Art—but, being itself the work of man, it greatly swells the preponderance of that kingdom in the Museum, and proportionately increases its claim for retaining possession. Come what may, the Library is a fixture.

In this great fixture, therefore, we recognise a kind of arbitrator on the point in dispute, namely, whether Natural History should go and Antiquities stay, or Antiquities go and Natural History stay. Whichever of these most needs the Library must be reasonably considered as most entitled to remain in immediate contiguity with it. Mr. Panizzi's arguments on this head, however lucid and convincing to ourselves, have, we understand, been looked upon as overstrained. The reasoning of this gentleman is that the antiquities now in the British Museum, partaking as they do equally of art and history, are considerably more *en rapport* with a great general library than the collections of natural history; books on science, such as the present age consults, being special, later, and fewer. And if this reasoning be brought into doubt, it is probably owing to a very inadequate conception on the part of the public as to the real value and extent of our antiquities, even under the head of sculpture alone. In deciding such a question as this, whether Art or Nature should vacate the great national Storehouse, it is so important to know how facts really stand that we do not scruple to give a short abstract of the character of our great monumental collections, considered in themselves, and also as compared with those on the Continent.

The truth is, that to assert that the collection of ancient sculptures at the British Museum is superior to that of any one Continental museum is to bestow on it very inadequate praise; it is not too much to say that in historical interest, and perhaps in mere market value, it surpasses all the public and private sculpture-galleries in Europe taken together. The reason for this is, that while the collections of ancient sculpture of Italy, France, and other European capitals are for the most part derived from Rome, or from provinces of the Western Roman Empire—that is to say, from the inferior and secondary sources of ancient art—the British Museum has been mainly fed from the fountain-head of Greece, Egypt, and Assyria. In the present condition of our national

national collection the historical sequence of these early sculptures is so little demonstrated—indeed, is so dislocated and interrupted—as greatly to impair the impression which the mere aspect of such a series ought to convey to the public mind.

It may be as well, therefore, here to pass briefly in review this great host of monuments of the ancient world. It is in the long series of statues in the Egyptian gallery that we must look for the earliest examples of ancient sculpture. This series commences with the Fourth Dynasty, which, whatever may be the limits of Egyptian chronology backwards, certainly precedes by many centuries the invasion by Cambyses, B.C. 525. Starting from this remote period, we may trace the history of Egyptian art downwards till the period of its decline, just before the Persian conquest.

Next in order come the monuments of Assyria, the latest of which probably is not more modern than B.C. 630, and for the earliest of which a much higher antiquity is claimed by the interpreters of cuneiform writing. Then come the earliest examples of Greek art: the statues from the Sacred Way at Branchidæ, the Harpy tomb in the Lycian-room, the draped female figure from Rhamnus, and the small Apollo in the Phigalian Room; all of which must be taken in connexion with various casts of early sculptures from Athens and Sicily scattered about the galleries. The casts of the Æginetan sculptures in the Phigalian Room form the connecting link between the Archaic period and the school of Phidias, as represented by the marbles from the Parthenon in the two Elgin-rooms. Other works from the same school are the friezes from the Temple of Apollo Epicurius at Phigalia, and from the temple of the Wingless Victory at Athens; while the Discobolus and the Diadumenos serve to give us some idea of the art of the two celebrated contemporaries of Phidias—Myron and Polycletus—so far as copies can represent originals. The colossal lion which once crowned a tomb on a promontory near Cnidus, and which is now crowded into a corner of a shed under the portico, has been connected with the naval victory of Conon, B.C. 394. If this supposition, which seems highly probable, be admitted, it would be an example of sculpture intermediate between the school of Phidias and the later Athenian school represented by Scopas and Praxiteles. The characteristics of this later school were suddenly revealed to us by the discovery by Mr. Newton of the remains of the Mausoleum in 1857, a discovery only second in importance to the acquisition of the sculptures of the Parthenon by Lord Elgin. To the age of Scopas, or to the schools immediately succeeding him, may likewise be attributed the

the statue of Bacchus from the Choragic monument of Thrasyllus in the second Elgin-room; the beautiful seated figure of Demeter, and other sculptures from Cnidus, the noble head of Æsculapius recently acquired from the Blacas Collection, the frieze from the Choragic monument of Lysikrates, and the colossal lion from the battle-field of Chæroneia (of which two latter monuments the British Museum only possesses casts); not to mention the varied and interesting collection of sculptures which have been acquired by Sir C. Fellowes, Mr. Newton, and other travellers from the coast of Asia Minor, especially Lycia, and from the Greek islands. The date of most of these sculptures falls probably between the time of Alexander the Great and the Augustan age.

We have now presented in historical succession the sculptures of the British Museum down to the Roman period. This last period, as is but natural, is not so fully represented here as in the museums of Italy. It is in the sculpture galleries of Rome, Naples, and Florence, that we find the finest examples of Roman art. In the other European museums we have for the most part a mass of mutilated and maltreated statues, made up for the market by restorations generally ill executed, and often founded on a total misconception of the original motive.

The Roman collection in the British Museum was formed principally by Mr. Townley at the close of the last century. Favoured by exceptional circumstances, and guided by a very fine taste, he managed to export from Rome a small but choice series of statues and busts, among which the exquisite female head misnamed Clytia, the Homer, and the Venus, enjoy a just celebrity. Since the acquisition of the Townley Gallery the Museum has been further enriched by the Mercury, the equestrian figure, and other statues from the Farnese Collection, and by the discovery of a whole museum of statues at Cyrene, of which the Apollo Citharœdus and the bust of Antoninus Pius would take high rank even in the Vatican.

The foregoing survey of the collection of ancient sculptures in the National Museum, hasty and imperfect as it is, will enable our readers to understand what are the peculiar and distinctive features of this collection, and in what points we may claim for it so great a superiority to the other European museums. These points are—

1. Our own is the only collection where the two great schools of Athenian sculpture—the earlier school of Phidias and the later school of Scopas and Praxiteles—can be properly studied in a series of original monumental works.

2. In no other museum are the great races of the ancient world,

world, by whom art was successively developed—that is to say, the Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, and Roman—represented in such just relative proportions.

Much might be said also of those collections—vases, bronzes, coins, terra cottas, &c.—which, taken conjointly with our Sculpture, may be considered to have developed the science of Archæology. Any one familiar with the Continental works connected with this comparatively modern study, is aware of the perpetual reference to our British Museum treasures as to the highest existing school. What the Villa Albani was to Winckelmann, the British Museum is now to all pursuing archæological researches. It is hardly necessary to point out that there is no study in the world which, taken as a whole, ramifies so widely and intricately among many other forms of knowledge, dead and living; none, therefore, to which a library such as that in the British Museum is so essential. Thus it is not too much to say that the antiquities assert a dependence upon the books from which natural history is comparatively exempt.

To return for a moment to the sculptures. One consequence of their vast importance is of a material kind, though not the less cogent where removals are contemplated. Adequate machinery and skilled labour may transport vast masses of granite or marble with safety, but it is utterly impossible to do so without enormous expense. The cost of moving the Rhameses' head merely from one part of the Egyptian Saloon to where it now stands, including the building of a solid block of masonry beneath, amounted to 195*l.* The danger also of moving marbles consisting of many fragments is great, the vibration tending to disjoint them. The statue of the ill-used Mausolus, for instance, consists of sixty-two pieces, and when, therefore, taken down and set up again, it is to be hoped it may be for the last time. There is no doubt that the arrangement of the sculptures leaves much to be desired in point of historical sequence and facility of survey; but, under the circumstances, it may be hoped that nothing beyond what is absolutely necessary will be attempted. Who shall say how far the best possible arrangements by scholars, artists, and archæologists, could be final, when new links may be unearthed for which no space in the chain has been provided. As in a game of patience, the fresh turned up card may refuse to fit on any previously laid out. But it is much to be wished that among the practicable changes may be included such modifications of the Elgin-rooms as may give greater height and distance to the range of pedimental sculpture, and also permit the frieze of the Panathenaic procession to be seen in its original continuity. For it may be observed, that, for the last ten years, some of

of the slabs have only been seen detached from their companions, and lying about on the floor. A plan to throw the first and second Elgin-saloons into one would embrace these two changes, and infinitely ennoble the effect of these incomparable objects.

We have dwelt on the merits of the sculpture party the more carefully because, in the unbecoming haphazard way in which such subjects are treated in our National Assembly, there is a liability to the last, that some turn of the legislative dice may exchange the better plan for the worse; leaving future generations to wonder how certain acts could ever have been passed. Even at this time, by one of those processes in our Government which are more matters of carelessness than treachery, we understand that some of the designs for the new National Gallery have been made to include space for antique sculpture, which points to an intention of breaking up the sculptural series in the Museum. We had been almost tempted to say that any decision, where all are so weary of delay, would be better than none; but, when we consider the decision that our representatives arrived at on the vexed question of the National Gallery and Royal Academy, by which, as now irrevocably fixed, each is adjudged the very site which would have best suited the other, and that at an enormous extra outlay to each, we revoke that sentiment.

One test of the arguments for retaining the antiquities undisturbed is to apply the same arguments in the opposite sense to the natural history; and here they will be found to do duty both ways. If we look at the expense of removal, it sinks to hundreds for the natural history,* where it mounts to thousands for the sculptures. If we examine the question of injury where they now are, the antiquities are taking comparatively none, the natural history very great. If the class of building necessary for their respective accommodation be taken into consideration, the sculptures require the costliness of a massive strength, quite superfluous for zoology and osteology. Further, should any destruction in moving occur, certain objects in art are finite in number, while a large proportion of stuffed animals may be replaced—have perished, been destroyed, and been replaced before, and, as years roll on, must be replaced again.

It is patent to all at all conversant with the statistics of the Museum, that none of its departments suffer so severely, and are so inadequately exhibited as that of natural history. It is a mistake to suppose that anybody can be so interested in changing their quarters as they themselves are. Mr. Panizzi was taunted

* Answer 546. Professor Owen. British Museum Committee. 1860.

more

more than ten years ago with a desire of 'throwing them out.' His answer is more applicable now than ever:—

'I would not throw them out; but I believe it would be for the good of the natural sciences that there should be an appropriate building erected for them, with plenty of space and plenty of accommodation. It has been said that I do not attach importance enough to natural history. I do attach great importance to it; it is because I attach great importance to it that I suggest, for the sake of science, that the natural history collections should be removed hence . . . at the present moment the officers of the natural history department have strongly represented to the Trustees that they cannot exhibit what they have; that they cannot increase the collection; that the collection which they have is not of the public use, and of the advantage to science which it is capable of being, because they have no room. I can assure the Commissioners that want of room is pressed on the Trustees more by the naturalists than by any one else . . . Depend upon it neither the Antiquities, nor the Library, nor the Natural History will thrive as they ought so long as they are together.' *

It is needless to revive the discussion whether Professor Owen requires five acres for the natural history collections, or can do with less. The likelihood is that he knows best. But those who profess to believe in the improvement of mind and manners derived by the lower classes from such exhibitions are especially bound to make them as perfect as possible. If the cry of raising the British workman by such agencies be a sincere thing and not mere claptrap, then by all means carry such agencies out to their consistent conclusions. There is something, however, in the reiteration with which the Committee of 1860 dwell on the popularity of the stuffed animals, and especially of the birds with bright plumage, with the more numerous class of visitors to the British Museum,—which leaves it doubtful whether they really consider that fact to be a proof of intelligence or the reverse. When M.P.s, deliberating on an important national subject, are so facetious as to quote M. de Verneuil's letter, we are not bound to know when they are in earnest. Admitting, however, that they are so in this instance, then how can they hesitate to make this class of popular pleasure more attractive still? Professor Owen, in his delightful little book †—one of the few fruits of this barren conflict—dwells on the fact that a Museum, destined to gratify the curiosity of the people and afford them subjects of rational contemplation, ought to exhibit the maximum of the dimensions of a class of animals peculiar for its bulk. 'The largest specimen

* Answer 1539. National Gallery Site Commission. 1857.

† 'On the Extent and Aims of a National Museum of Natural History.' 1862.

of

of the whale that can be procured ought, therefore, to be in a national museum.' Who is there among us, high or low, old or young, who will not subscribe to this? The whale is an 'idea' all would be curious to verify. And our great Northern whale is threatened with a more stimulating prestige still, from the probability of its extinction at no remote period. Yet, by the oddest of compromises, those who are all for gratifying the taste of the people for stuffed beasts, are the first to grudge the necessary space for exhibiting the greatest wonder of the animal creation. It is strange but true that while a skeleton of a whale, more than 60 feet long, lies successfully concealed in the vaults below, the only representative of the order Cetacea exhibited in the British Museum is a little porpoise, hung up on high on the walls. And it is the same with the larger classes of elephants; all we can afford to admit are babies of a few weeks old, which take very little room! Are these the facts which result from a sincere belief in the pleasure and improvement derived by the lower orders from the contemplation of natural history?

As regards specimens of extinct animals, Professor Owen observes: 'It is the common experience of officers of National Museums that no specimens of natural history so much excite the interest and wonder of the public, so sensibly gratify their curiosity, are the subjects of such prolonged and profound contemplation as these reconstructed skeletons of large extinct animals.'* Yet it is precisely the largest and most marvellous of these monsters that have, owing to want of space, been refused by the British Museum, namely, two almost entire skeletons of the curious extinct whale called the Zeuglodon, which, when declined here, were gladly purchased by the Royal Museum at Berlin.

And among such marvels of nature are some which appeal to the comprehension not only of the sharp Londoner, but to that of the merest country bumpkin; for instance, the specimens of extinct oxen—'double the size of the largest bovine animal that now exists'—calculated to stimulate the dormant brain of the veriest Hodge that ever stumped into the Museum on hobnails.

The more anxious therefore the Commissioners of 1860 are to impress on the world the popularity and attractiveness of the Natural History, the more thoroughly do they remove any scruples as to a step which will relieve the over-burdened Institution in the same degree as it will benefit that department. *We* do not say that these collections are more popular than all others in the building, for as far as an approximate calculation of visitors could

* 'National Museum of Natural History,' p. 68.

be

be made, this assertion is not borne out by figures; yet, doubtless, if an estimate could be formed of the *class* of visitors, it would be found that the sympathies of uneducated minds are more attracted by the wonders of the animal creation than by any forms of art and archæology. It is for their interest, therefore, that this department should be as soon as practicable exhibited to them under every advantage that a building erected expressly for it can command.

For we assign not the slightest importance to a plea, barely tenable in 1857, and utterly untenable now, namely, that the removal of these collections from their present position 'would excite the strongest dissatisfaction both among the inhabitants of London and the visitors from the country.' It is a fact established by most interesting statistical evidence before the Commission,* that the working classes as a rule, prefer, if possible, to combine a little fresh air with some interesting sight; and that it is their increasing tendency to go far, rather than near, for their holiday pleasure. When the railway to Hampton Court was first opened, the visitors to the British Museum declined in one year by more than 55,000. Indeed the truth is, the number of visitors to Bloomsbury, though still so great, has fallen off in the same proportion that those to Kew Gardens, and, what is more to our point, to the South Kensington Museum, have increased. It is within the memory of living man that the British Museum was as much in the suburbs of London as Kensington now is. And when the population of a district has so augmented, and that with a due proportion of the working classes at the new 6*l.* franchise, as to be raised to the dignity of a borough, as Brompton and Kensington now are, it is futile to talk of their being out of the way. Wherever we place the new Institution it must be far from something, though not necessarily inaccessible even from the furthest east of London; for, by the time a suitable building can be erected for the Natural History, the Metropolitan Railway will have brought the most remote parts of the metropolis and Kensington within cheap and easy distance of each other.

Other objections strongly urged by the Committee, such as the expense of a separate staff, and the necessity of a special library, will be found on inspection equally to melt into thin air. The expense of staff would be an objection to increase of space, but not to change of locality. If the natural history department is to be put on a decorous footing a proportionate increase of staff must follow; but these bipeds will not cost the nation more at Kensington than in Bloomsbury. As to the special library

* British Museum Commission, 1860, p. 219.

required,

required, that difficulty will be met half way, if, as presumed, Sir Joseph Banks's Library accompany the natural sciences whenever they migrate. A further purchase, it is true, of necessary works, which already exist in the great Museum Library, must be made; we are not aware, however, that any objection has been ever raised to the valuable duplicate library formed at South Kensington, including illustrated works on art fully as expensive as those required for the purposes of science.

Another point which has been kept so studiously in the background throughout all these investigations, that it is not difficult to perceive how much it lies at the root of the vulgar prejudices which have distorted and delayed this question, is that of the management. There has been no need for us to approach this topic; the Trustees of the British Museum, however attacked, need no defence. But we trace with regret this prejudice in the otherwise judicious and equitable pages of M. de Triquéti's 'Trois Musées.' As a foreigner this gentleman cannot be expected to understand a phase of our social system, which, both in the administration of the law and of certain trusts, enlists the gratuitous services of a class of noblemen and gentlemen which the absence of the habit of self-government has failed to rear elsewhere. But he is strangely blind to the contradictions involved in his own statements. What can be said of a writer who enthusiastically lauds the objects acquired in a certain Institution, the manner in which they are acquired, the admirable choice of the curators, the enlightened liberality with which the administration welcomes a new and good idea, which he more especially signalises as 'a marvellous fact—a *rara avis in terrâ*'—who in short sees nothing in the workings and results of this Institution that he does not vainly covet for his own country,—and who yet in the same breath indulges in the most inconsequent *tirades* against the system which has brought forth such enviable fruits? What we shall say is, that as regards the results, he has exerted his own excellent judgment; as regards the system, he has been crammed by another. This is the more unreasoning on his part, for his very comparisons with the mode of conducting such matters in France show how little, in his opinion, would be gained by our adoption of it. Not that we join conclusions with him on this point. The experiment of responsible directorship over special institutions has been vindicated here by such precedents as the conduct of the Kew Gardens by the late Sir William Hooker, and of the National Gallery by the late Sir Charles Eastlake. There is no doubt that the same system will be the most desirable for the new National Museum

of Natural History, and as little doubt that the Trustees of the British Museum will be foremost to approve it.

We have now, to the best of our ability, endeavoured to enlighten our readers as to the actual condition of our great National Depository up to this date. Relying, however, on the distinct pledge, given by Mr. Disraeli, at the close of last summer, that he would bring forward a measure for providing additional space for the British Museum, we confidently anticipate that the Session of 1868 will see this question brought to an issue in that spirit of judicious and liberal appreciation to which it is so eminently entitled. Without presuming to suggest any precise course of legislation, we would submit that there are three main points to be kept in view by those who have to deal with this problem.

1. The land purchased by the Government at South Kensington, in 1863, is amply sufficient for a Museum of Natural History, even on the large scale required by Professor Owen.

2. The removal of the natural history from the British Museum would provide ample accommodation for such antiquities as can be exhibited to most advantage on the upper floor; as well as for the much straitened department of prints and drawings.

3. Sufficient space for the accommodation of the sculpture—including the release of Mausolus and his fellow captives—and for other purposes, will be found in that part of the British Museum site still unenclosed. Those of our readers who may desire to satisfy themselves that such available space exists, we refer to Mr. Panizzi's very comprehensive Report in the Return of 1862, and to the admirably careful plans which accompany it. These plans show how the new galleries can be dove-tailed into the old ones, so as to facilitate that chronological arrangement of our great sculptural series which is desirable; and also to afford that margin of space around certain monuments, without which no just idea of their magnitude and grandeur can be obtained. For it is not enough to admit visitors to stand beneath the shadow of a colossal lion, or a gigantic skeleton, they must have room to go back from such objects, and view them at the distance for which their size is calculated.

And before closing this subject we may be permitted to advert more particularly to a distinguished name which is indissolubly connected with the fame and fortunes of the British Museum, and to which frequent reference has been made in this article. Like a self-satisfied people, as in some respects we are, we have been apt to merge our pride in the possession of Mr. Panizzi, as the head of this National Institution, in the admiration of our own good sense in having placed him there.

One

One result of these public Commissions, one compensation for their frequent fruitlessness, is the faithful record they incidentally preserve of the individuality of such men as Mr. Panizzi. In these answers before his peers, better than in any writings, speeches, or notes of conversation, posterity will trace the power, judgment, clearness, fairness, and even the wit of the great magnate of learning, who has borne the Museum through stormy times on his Atlas-like shoulders. Earnestly do we hope that he will yet live to see the separation of those collections, which, in his judgment, will thrive best apart.

ART. VI.—1. *Human Longevity.* By James Easton. Salisbury. 1799.

2. *The Code of Health and Longevity.* In 4 Vols. By Sir John Sinclair, Bart. Edinburgh. 1807.

3. *Annals of Health and Long Life.* By Joseph Taylor. London. 1818.

4. *Records of Longevity.* By Thomas Bailey. London. 1857.

5. *Long-livers; a curious History of Persons of both Sexes, who have lived several ages and grown young again.* By Eugenius Philalethes. London. 1722.

6. *Hermippus Redivivus; or the Sage's Triumph over Old Age and the Grave.* Third Edition. London. 1771.

7. *A Treatise on Temperance.* By Lodowick Cornaro, a noble gentleman of Venice. Faithfully Englished. London. 1678.

IT is told of the late Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, that, when canvassing Herefordshire in 1852, he was in the midst of an enquiry into the truth of reported cases of longevity. This enquiry was so far uppermost in his thoughts, that when a Tory voter flatly declined to support his candidature, he placidly responded, 'I am sorry you can't give me your vote, but perhaps you can tell me whether any person has died in your parish at an extraordinary age.' The story is characteristic, and students of 'Notes and Queries' will remember that the statesman of whom it is told contributed to that periodical several papers on longevity and centenarianism—topics which have ever possessed an attraction for the learned and unlearned, and about which there is such a dash of romance and marvel as to make them peculiarly fit game for a mind which is set upon 'stablishing truth and startling error.' It is a pity that the research of Sir G. C. Lewis was so early lost to his generation; though he was, we suspect, on the high way to become convinced 'nolens volens' that there were in his

own day flawless cases of *female* centenarianism, although the parish registers ransacked at his instance had failed to satisfy him as to males of equal length of years. We must own, too, that while sharing to the full the national pride in so remarkable a scholar, our reverence for his powers of investigation fails to force assent to one of his arguments with regard to longevity, namely, that, because since the Christian æra no person of royal or noble birth mentioned in history has reached the age of one hundred years, there is a presumption that human life, under existing circumstances, does not reach that term. He was wont to argue that, the higher the rank, the greater would be the care with which life would be tended, the greater the chance of accuracy with regard to dates, the more favourable in all respects the conditions required for length of days. Now, it does not appear, either at first sight or after a review of the lucubrations of writers on longevity, that 'gentle nurture' has any special title to claim the largest number of candidates for its honours. Exposure to weather, inevitable in the case of the poorer classes, is, no doubt, a great cause of early mortality; but it is a fact, quite as fully established, that however much cold and hardship try the general health up to mid-age, those who hold out till that period against these generally live long. In Sir John Sinclair's exhaustive 'Code of Health and Longevity,' Dr. Waterhouse, Professor of Physic at Cambridge, New England, in 1804, is quoted as attributing the many instances of longevity which his country affords to the mediocrity of men's circumstances. 'We are not,' he writes, 'rich enough to be luxurious, nor so distressed by poverty as to be pressed prematurely to the grave;'* and this remark, though it points to the midway between the richest and the poorest as the likeliest field of long-life, would assuredly exclude the heads that wear a crown, as well as those of the ranks which are entitled, more or less, to stand near the throne. The cares of state—the excitements of politics or military enterprise—the brainwork incidental to tangled policies and court cabals—are sufficiently calculated to wear out a very delicately-constructed machine, to justify the resort to other classes than the highest, or even the high, for the discovery of cases of longevity. 'It is not,' says Easton, a well-known collector of cases of long life, 'the rich or great, not those who depend on medicines, that become old, but such as use much exercise, are exposed to the fresh air, and whose food is plain and moderate, as farmers, gardeners, fishermen, labourers, soldiers, and such men as perhaps never employed their thoughts on the means used to promote longevity.'†

* 'Sir John Sinclair,' i. 109; cf. iv. 532, &c.
† Easton, Introduction, pp. xi. xii.

No

No doubt there is cogency in Sir G. C. Lewis's argument, that, the lower the rank, the greater will be the tendency to marvel at reputed old age. Sympathy, interest, charity, will combine to bruit about the miracle; and among the illiterate, who have little of the sceptical element, such errors as arise out of confounding parent with child, or two children of the same family and name, of whom the second is born after the death of the first, one with another, will naturally pass undetected more frequently than in a higher grade of society. Such mistakes nullify a fair sprinkling of well-promising cases; and not a few, probably, are referable to witless ignorance on the one side, or to witting mischief and waggery on the other. The rustic will gape unsuspectingly at the tombstone at Chave Prior, Worcestershire, which ascribes to an old forefather of the hamlet the goodly length of 309 years. But the record meant nothing patriarchal. The village chiseller, hazy about numeration, wished to score 39, and engraved 30 first and 9 afterwards. In St. Leonard's churchyard, Shoreditch, there is or was a gravestone, on which, by a subsequent alteration of 1 into 2 by some wag, a buried worthy has the credit of 100 more years than the hundred and seven, which his relatives attributed to him. Yet, allowance made for ignorance and credulity, mischief and exaggeration, it is hard to conceive that of the very many cases quoted, in which persons have exceeded a hundred years, a tolerable residuum will not survive the sifting-process. If persons within our knowledge have reached ninety-seven or ninety-eight years, why limit man's life to that bound, and discredit all alleged excesses of four, five, or half a dozen years? Concede the excess over the Psalmist's figure of as many years as twenty-six or twenty-eight, and what forbids us to allow it to be made thirty or thirty-five? The line is drawn too tightly. If we credit the extension of man's years to within three or four short of a hundred, the upholders of man's longevity under favourable conditions have gained a large admission, and can afford to allow a rebate or discount upon their occasionally much larger figures.

And that such an extension of man's term of days is not inconsistent with the analogies of brute life the researches of Buffon and Haller have gone far to show. The former held that 'the man who did not die of accidental causes reached, everywhere, the age of ninety or a hundred;' and the physiologist agrees in substance with the naturalist. The calculation of Buffon was based on the proportion which duration of life bears, in all animals, to duration of years of growth. A dog attains full growth in two years, which he can multiply by five or six in his term of life. The horse, full grown at four years, can live

five six or seven times as long, i. e. twenty-five or twenty-six years. On the same principle, argued Buffon, man, fourteen years in growing, can live six or seven times that term, or, to ninety or a hundred years. The researches, too, of the French physicians, most recently those of Dr. Acosta of Paris, into the subject of the commencement of decadence, while shewing much diversity as to the 'climacteric'—which according to the Greeks was 42, according to M. Flourens 70, and according to the Arabs 63 and 81, i. e. seven times and nine times their magic 'nine'—corroborate the opinion that certain organizations are proof against the ravages of time and the attacks of sickness and death. Some men retain their vigour of mind and intellect till ninety or a hundred. In his 'Traité de la vieillesse Hygiénique' (constantly quoted in M. Flourens's interesting chapter 'on old age',*, M. Reveillé-Parise, a deceased physician and philanthropist, distinguishes between the life of action and the life of power, the 'vireo in posse' and the 'vireo in actu,' the 'forces in reserve' and the 'forces in use,' which are the disposable fund of man's strength. As he descends the hill of life he finds the lack of the former, which in youth were superabundant; he has to trust in the main to his 'active forces.' If he draws upon those in reserve, he may run a risk of his draught being dishonoured. From this point of view, the typically healthy old man will, according to M. Reveillé-Parise, be he who, beside 'knowing how to be old' and 'knowing himself well,' is careful to conform to regular habits, and, above all, '*to attack every malady at its source.*' The object of this last rule is to cut short at once whatsoever has a tendency to exhaust the 'forces in use'—the only forces, in short, that are available to age. It is reasonable enough that (sickness and accident not intervening) the conscious or unconscious observance of these rules by persons of a healthy organization may land them very close to the verge of that centenarianism which Buffon considers the ordinary, not extraordinary, limit of human life. But to turn from analogies and probabilities to data which are more or less matter of fact.

We shall glean from writers or compilers some of the more memorable instances of longevity. The subject is as fertile in romance as in tolerably veracious history. From the data furnished by the latter a few deductions, chiefly of negative character, will be made; and, in connection with these, we may be permitted to glance at various schemes for attaining long life. And hence we may be led to practical conclusions as to the fruits

* 'On Human Longevity, and the amount of Life upon the Globe.' By P. Flourens. Translated from the French by C. Martell. Second Edition. C. 2. pp. 23-50. London, 1855.

of

of enquiring into a subject which has attracted the curious from time immemorial, and we may perhaps be able to establish, not so much that longevity is in itself a matter to be coveted, as that there are secondary senses in which 'days long in the land' are as attainable as they are legitimate objects of desire.

The representative names of the annals of ultra-longevity are the Countess of Desmond, Old Parr, and Henry Jenkins. Two of this famous trio have an enhanced interest, as first links in short chains connecting 'now' with 'long long ago.' The late Marquis of Bristol in 1851, being then 83, averred that, when he was a young man, the Dowager Lady Stanhope used to say she 'knew a lady who had known a lady who had seen the old Countess of Desmond, who danced with Richard the Third, when Duke of Gloucester—only two ladies between Lady Stanhope and the old Countess.'* The grandfather of Campbell, the poet, knew a gentleman who had seen Lady Desmond, and another account gives four links of lives between the old Countess who was born in 1465, and a lady alive in 1859. Katherine Fitzgerald, this famous old Lady Desmond, is said to have been twenty years of age at the time of Bosworth Field (1485). Sir Walter Raleigh knew her in 1589, when she would be 124, and Fynes Morrison, the traveller, speaks of her as alive when he was in Ireland, where she resided, from 1599 to 1603. What Sir W. Temple records of her is hearsay from the Earl of Leicester, and there is not much to be made of what Horace Walpole contributed to her history. Writers in 'Notes and Queries,' and a contributor to the 'Quarterly Review,'† have, we think, settled the question that she lived 140 years, but not that she travelled from Ireland to London in 1614, when she would have been 150. Bacon, in his 'Natural History,' says she cut a new set of teeth in her old age—a circumstance not unprecedented in the 'Records of Longevity;' and Morrison declares that when sevenscore she was wont to walk four or five miles to market. If so, she might have had vigour left to climb the nut-tree, through a fall from which, tradition says, she came by her death; though a modern humourist evidently thought this statement required qualifying when he did not venture to say more of her than

> 'That she lived to much more than a hundred and ten,
> And died from a fall from a cherry tree then.'‡

This catastrophe may have furnished a climax for a local ballad, which we cut a few months since from a county newspaper, 'The

* 'Notes and Queries,' 2nd Series, vol. vii. 313, 365, 431. † March, 1853.
‡ Walpole's Letters (Nos. 1602-1657) leave it doubtful whether it was a cherry-tree or a walnut.

three

three old men of Painswick.' A pilgrim, so it runs, finds a very old man weeping. On asking the cause, he is told the old man's father has been beating him. The pilgrim remonstrates with the Gloucestershire Methuselah for his parental severity, and learns that it had been called forth by the 'old boy' pelting his grandfather, who was up in an apple-tree. Hinc illæ lacrimæ!

Another linking of the 'dead past with the living present' is suggested by the name of Henry Jenkins. To put the case as stated in the 'Edinburgh Courant' two years ago, an octogenarian alive in 1865 had seen Peter Garden, of Auchterless, who died at the age of 126, and who, when twelve years old (in 1670), had heard Jenkins give evidence at York, that, when a boy, 'he carried arms up the hill to the Battle of Flodden.' But the editor of 'Notes and Queries' proves this chain incomplete. Not to enumerate the inaccuracies in the statement attributed to Jenkins, it is scarcely credible that Garden, a Scotch boy of twelve years old, should have chanced to be at York so exactly in the nick of time as to hear Jenkins give evidence at the Assizes, *in the very year in which Jenkins died.* This is just such a chink in the joints of the harness as Mr. Thoms loves to pierce.* But Peter Garden's death happened in 1775, of which there happens to be evidence, although none of his date of birth, or birthplace. Either then the octogenarian underrated his own age by ten years, or saw the afore-mentioned Peter Garden ten years before he was himself in the body—a dilemma fatal to this loose-hanging fabric. Jenkins's epitaph in Bolton Church is no sort of evidence, as it was composed by Dr. Thomas Chapman, Master of Magdalen, Cambridge, some eighty years after Jenkins's death.

Old Parr's story, though not the subject of any similar linking process, has connected with it much curious fact, and perhaps as much impudent romance. Thomas Parr was born at Alberbury, near Church Stretton, Salop, in 1483. He married his first wife at eighty, and lived with her thirty-two years. Eight years after her death the old man, then 120, married a second wife, with whom scandal says that he had been smitten during his first wife's life-time. This second marriage he survived thirty-two years, and then only cut short his days by assenting to so total a change of life as a removal from the condition of a village rustic to the bustle and excitement of life in London, whither the Earl of Arundel transported him, apparently as a curiosity to amuse the quality, for he was presented, it seems, to Charles I. and his Court. Poor old man! he missed his cheese and onion, his daily milk or whey, and his holiday cup of ale or cider, when, to

* 'Notes and Queries,' 2nd Series, vol. x. 156. Bailey's 'Records of Longevity,' p. 64.

prolong

prolong his life, he was fed on the best of everything in his patron's London mansion. The famous Dr. Harvey ascertained by a post-mortem examination that but for this change he might have lived much longer. In 1635 the patriarch rested at last, finding a grave in Westminster Abbey, and a 'vates sacer' in Taylor, the water-poet. There is reason to believe that this writer's contemporary pamphlet, entitled 'The Olde, Olde, very Olde Man, or the Age and Long Life of Thomas Parr,' is in the main reliable. Taylor says of Parr's diet:—

> 'His physic was good butter, which the soil
> Of Salop yields, more sweet than Candy oil,
> And garlic he esteemed beyond the rate
> Of Venice treacle or best mithridate.
> He entertained no gout, no ache he felt,
> The air was good and temperate where he dwelt,
> While mavisses and sweet-tongued nightingales
> Did chaunt him roundelays and madrigals.
> Thus living within bounds of nature's laws
> Of his long lasting life may be some cause.'

In the evidence for Parr's 152 years there may possibly be a flaw or two, but we are disposed to accept as fact his exceptional longevity. Romance stepped in after his death to enhance the marvel. Sticklers for hereditary longevity, for instance, eagerly seized an illustration of their theory in the circumstance that Robert Parr, of Kinver, near Stourbridge, a grandson (so they affirm) of the 'olde, olde man,' lived to the age of 124 (A.D. 1633-1757). Unfortunately for their theory, which further gives Robert's father a span of 109 years, and his grandfather 113, it is recorded of Thomas Parr that he had but two children by his first wife, both of whom died young, and one, a daughter, by his second. If so, Robert's lineage requires explanation; and this is not so trifling a point as it may seem, for thereon depends the coherence of the tradition of 'Parr's Pills.' The puffers of that valuable property purport to have discovered a parchment two hundred years old, in which Parr bequeaths to his second great-grandson 'ye method employed for preparing ye medicament' whereby he attained his miraculous old age. But this figment is a timid affair compared with the tract which they vend under the title of the 'Extraordinary Life and Times of old Parr.' The writer, had he minded his dates, and not overcrowded his canvass, might have taken high rank as an historico-sensationalist. According to him, Lord Arundel, chancing to see old Parr doing penance in Alberbury Church at the age of 102, at once offered him a situation in his family. Under the Earl's roof he became acquainted with a distinguished visitor, the old Countess of

Desmond,

Desmond, to whom he imparted some of the life-pills which had kept him young and vigorous so long. The fortuitous concurrence of two such old people might have satisfied an every-day romancist, but not so the ingenious pill-puffer. After old Lady Desmond's demise the venerable Parr (at the age of 118) conceived a desire to visit Henry Jenkins, Shropshire and Yorkshire being in those days, we conclude, within easy distance of each other. Old Parr travels to 'Ellerton,' has a chat with Jenkins, then only a hundred, and leaves him a supply of 'ye famous medicament,' which enables him to gain flesh and to follow the occupation of a fisherman some sixty-nine years longer. Parr's connexion with the life-pills is probably about as real as with his supposed great-grandson at Kinver. But, after clearing away the exaggerations, there must remain in these three cases a large substratum of truth. They are not transparently fabulous, like the myth which one Astephius circulated of himself, that he was 1025 years old when he wrote a certain work,* or the story of a sheikh at Smyrna still alive, although not a day less than 600 years of age.†

Minor improbabilities crop out occasionally in records of longevity, such as that a lady of South Carolina had measles at the age of ninety-nine; that Mary Costello's grandmother lived to 125, and long before she died had to be rocked in a cradle like a baby; and that Mr. John Weeks, who lived to be 114, married his tenth wife when he was 106, she being sixteen at that time. May and December assuredly! But, to confine ourselves to more prosaic records, the lists of Easton, Bailey, Taylor, and other collectors of cases of longevity, furnish so large a number which verge on, or pass the verge of, a hundred years, that, if we accept an eighth part of these, it will result that centenarianism is neither impossible nor improbable. A great preponderance of instances will consist of persons in humble station. Life in the open air, plain diet, regular occupation, all tend to preserve health and vigour. But if, taking a leaf out of the sceptic's book, we allow a very large margin for inaccuracies arising from carelessness, ignorance, and credulity, it is but fair to limit this allowance mainly to the lower classes, while we claim for higher grades more or less title to credence.

Among high and low, however, one fact is equally ascertained—that women have the advantage of men as regards length of days. According to Hufeland,‡ a great Prussian authority, 'not only

* See 'Hermippus Redivivus' (London, 1771), p. 166, where it is said that 'a man must sure have an ostrich's stomach to digest this.'

† See 'Notes and Queries,' 3rd Series, vol. vii. 150.

‡ Hufeland 'On the Art of Prolonging Human Life,' i. 168; quoted by Sir John Sinclair, i. 66.

do

do women live longer than men, but married women longer than single, in the proportion, according to some registers, of two to one. Only men, however, attain the utmost extent of longevity. The pliability of the female body gives it for a time more durability, but as strength is essential to very great length of life, though more women than men become old, fewer become very old.' It may not be amiss to take a few instances from this more enduring as well as gentler sex. David Garrick's widow survived that eminent tragedian forty-three years, and died in 1822, aged ninety-nine. She had, before her marriage, been a dancer on the boards of Drury-lane, and was a native of Vienna. She died in her chair, retaining her faculties to the last. Bailey cites, too vaguely perhaps for the sceptical, the Hon. Mrs. Watkins of Glamorganshire, who died in 1790, aged 110. The year before she died she made a trip from Wales to London, to see Mrs. Siddons act. Nine visits did she make to the theatre during her stay, retiring prudently before the after-piece: and, besides this, she sat for her portrait, and ascended to the 'Whispering Gallery' at St. Paul's. She got safe home; and London did not prove her Capua, as it did old Parr's. A more irrefragable case, perhaps, is that of Mrs. Williams, of Moor Park, Herts, and Bride-head, Dorset, who died, aged 102, in 1841, and of whom her great-grandson avers* that she was couched for cataract when 81, and made a speech, upstanding, to her tenantry, when they congratulated her on her hundredth birthday. No attempt has been made to invalidate this communication of her descendant. The three old ladies above mentioned might object to the company into which for the nonce we introduce them, in taking next Mrs., or, as she was commonly called, 'Lady' Lewson, an eccentric widow, who died in London in 1806 at the age of 106. Born in Essex-street, Strand, and married early, she was left a rich widow at six-and-twenty. For the rest of her days her chief companions were an old man-servant, two dogs, and a cat. In dress she was fanciful and particular, adhering steadfastly to the fashions of her youth, when George I. was king. But she was a decided foe to cleanliness. Her rooms were never washed, seldom swept; and to personal ablutions she was an utter stranger. 'People who washed themselves,' she said, 'were always catching cold.' She used to smear face and neck with hog's lard, and to 'top up,' as regarded her cheeks, with rose-pink. Her health was good to the last, and she cut two new teeth at eighty-seven. She was buried at Bunhill Fields Burying-ground.

---

* 'Notes and Queries,' 2nd Series, vol. xi. 58

We

We could cite from personal knowledge another widow-lady, who died in her ninety-seventh year, preserving to the last her health and faculties, and interest in all around her, and going twice to church on Sundays till the week of her death. Most memorable in this venerable dame, whose name no dweller between the Severn and the Wye would need to be told, was her wonderful gift of being able, from long observation and experience,* to form an almost unfailing induction as to what would happen in any matter, the issue of which was to others 'in dubio.' But there are cases of equal longevity among single women. Miss Baillie, the sister of Joanna, (who lived to 89) and of the eminent London physician, was alive at Hampstead in 1861, and beginning a second century of existence. Miss Elizabeth Gray died in 1856, aged 108, having been born in 1748. She was a daughter of William Gray, writer, of Newholm, Edinburgh, and her mother and sisters also lived to very advanced age. She survived her father one hundred years, and, stranger still, was buried beside a half-brother, who had been dead 128 years. This case is stated in Chambers' 'Book of Days,'† where it is said that her birth is chronicled in the registers of Dolphington parish, and her parentage and length of days well known in the upper circles of Edinburgh. These cases would be hard to disprove. Others appear less reliable. A rather promising instance, Miss Mary Billinge,‡ whose claim to 112 years was in a fair way to be established in 'Notes and Queries,' has been ruthlessly upset by a keen-scented investigator, who proves a mistaken identity, and reduces her years to ninety-one. Dolly Pentreath, the last person, it is said, who could speak the ancient Cornish language, had some pretensions to be 102 years of age at her decease. Stern investigation, however, has reduced her age by eleven years at the least, and, if she was baptised in infancy, by perhaps thirty-eight years. This is sharp work with the faith of such Cornishmen as still cling to the legend of a once-existing epitaph to the old lady which, when translated from her vernacular into ours, ran as follows :—

> 'Old Doll Pentreath, one hundred aged and two,
> Deceased and buried in Paul parish too.
> Not in the church, with people great and high,
> But in the churchyard doth old Dolly lie.' §

But the inscribed granite obelisk, which, through the interest of

---

* Aristot. Eth. VI., xi. 6, *ὥστε δεῖ προσέχειν τῶν ἐμπείρων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἢ φρονίμων ταῖς ἀνυποδείκτοις φάσεσι καὶ δόξαις οὐχ ἧσσον ἀποδείξεων. διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἔχειν ἐκ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὄμμα ὁρῶσιν ὀρθῶς.*

† 'Book of Days,' i. 463.

‡ 'Notes and Queries,' 3rd Series, vol. vii. 112, 154, 504.

§ See 'Notes and Queries,' 2nd Series, vol. i. 17.

Prince

Prince Lucien Bonaparte in the old woman's linguistic fame, actually surmounts her grave, is prudently silent as to her much-vexed age.* From centenarian females in humble life we shall cull only two more cases, Mary Burke, of Stewart's Rents, Drury-lane, London, and Anna Brestow, of Moss Dale, Culbeck, Cumberland, both of whom died in 1789, the former at the age of 105, and the latter of 102, representatives apparently of long life under very diverse conditions.

To turn to the briefer-lived 'lords of creation,'—is their tenure incapable of extraordinary extension in certain cases? It seems not, if we are content with less rigid evidence than certificates of baptism and burial. Approximate evidence of an individual's age would be the 'constans opinio' of two or three generations round the spot where he lived, corroborating his imputed length of days. From their tenure of livings, their daily presence among their people, the ease with which their lowest age at ordination can be ascertained, cases of longevity among the clergy seem least likely to rest on slender foundations. Their regularity of life, out-door habits, and comparative immunity from excitement, make us expect to find old age common in their ranks. Accordingly it would be hard to find a flaw in the alleged centenarianism of Dr. Totty, Rector of Fairlight and of Etchingham, near Hastings, who died in 1857, at the age of 101. He was as well known in Bath as in his own county, and, as far as we can discover, his case remains undisputed. The instances of an incumbent of Staunton-on-Wye in Herefordshire, who died in 1790 at the reputed age of 105 (the Rev. W. Davis), and of the Rev. Peter Alley, of Dunamoni, in Ireland, who died in 1763, at the age of 111, may, we should think, be depended on. The latter held his benefice seventy-three years, which, with twenty-four years previous to taking priest's orders, would give him a minimum age of ninety-seven. This worthy, we learn, was regular and temperate, had had two wives, and was the father of thirty-three children by them. The English divine with whom we couple him seems to have defied the usual rules for attaining long life. For the last thirty-five years of his life he took little in-door, and no out-door, exercise. He lived well and fed heartily, taking buttered rolls for breakfast, and hot roast meat for supper.† He always drank wine, *but never to excess.*

* On this subject see also the remarks in the 'Quarterly Review,' No. 245, p. 40.

† The present incumbent of Staunton-on-Wye, the Rev. H. W. Phillott, informs us that Mr. Davis became incumbent of Staunton-on-Wye in 1733, and held that benefice till 1790. He appears in the register to have been aged 105. The burial places of his wife and some children are specified. He was an 'eminently careful and exact scribe; and the registers, during his incumbency, were a pattern of neatness and calligraphy.' Mr. Phillott, whose accuracy and research are well known, thinks that Mr. Davis's age is well authenticated.

It

It was the same with another famous longevitarian of nearly the same date, but in the Romish Church—Cardinal de Solis, Archbishop of Seville. He died in his 110th year, in 1785, with every faculty, except his hearing, unimpaired. He imputed his green old age to a sober, studious life, regular exercise, and a good conscience, as well as to a pint of the best Xeres at each meal, except in very cold weather, when he allowed himself a third more.

None of the Popes attained extreme length of days, though more than one offered premiums for the secret of attaining them. Our later primates have sometimes lived to a respectable longevity, as might be expected of men who have reached the 'ne plus ultra' of their profession. And a Bishop of Lichfield, Morton, died at ninety-five.

Lord Clarendon, in his autobiography, remarks on the longevity of lawyers, which he ascribes to 'the exercise they give themselves by their circuits, as well as to their other acts of temperance and sobriety.'* Our modern legal luminaries are fairly long-lived. The late Lord Lyndhurst, the veterans Brougham and Pollock, are instances of this, though they might be distanced by the 'olde olde men' of other professions. Lord Mansfield, often quoted on the score of age, died at 89, Lord Kaimes at 86; Lord Monboddo, who had his crotchets as well as his cases to wear out his brain, lived to be 90. Lord Stowell was 91, Lord Eldon 87. The physicians have rarely succeeded in personal illustration of the art of preserving life. Perhaps they have doubted whether the end is worth the means; for though Galen is said to have lived to 140 years, and Hippocrates to 104, in modern days we can adduce few who lived past ninety, like Dr. Heberden, or the Swedish Dr. Jernitz, who reached 104 by an elixir of his own compounding. The ages of literary men are rarely very great, and, where exceptional longevity does crop out, it is in such cases as that of Samuel Rogers, the poet and table-talker, who published his first volume of poems two years after Dr. Johnson's death, and in a leisurely, luxurious way kept up his connexion with literature till his death in his 93rd year, in 1855. Hoyle, the author of the Whist treatise, was in his 98th year when he died. Fontenelle, the witty, placid Parisian man of letters, who was said to have as good a heart as could be made out of brains, lived to be a hundred. Around his name might be grouped those of other Parisian beaux-esprits of the same period, but it is to this type of littérateurs, and not to the more solid and earnest advancers of

* 'Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon,' vol. i. p. 32. Oxford, 1828.

learning,

learning, that we must look for nonagenarians and centenarians.* Irritability frequently accompanies genius. Envy keeps some back from honour, until it seems scarce worth the quest. Disappointment, more than aught else, shortens life, by making the owner indifferent to it. And brain work is surely not conducive to longevity. Few engineers, or artists, are long lived; less than ever in these days of enterprise and excitement. Though James Watt reached 83, the elder Brunel 81, and Telford 77, the younger Brunel and the younger Stephenson were far from 'attaining unto the days of the years of their fathers.' So with the devotees of art, few out of many have reached extreme old age. Michael Angelo Buonarotti, painter, sculptor, and architect, finished a life of patient working at the age of 90. Sir Christopher Wren sleeps under his own fabric, where he found his rest at the age of 91. But these are exceptional cases, as among painters is that of Titian, who died of the plague at the age of 99, and that of Conrad Roepel, of the Hague, who lived to be a hundred; although no doubt industry might hunt up some few octogenarians.

Of actors, Macklin is the representative centenarian. Like others, who set themselves to compass longevity, he forsook in good time his youthful irregularities. For his last sixty-seven years he made health his business and study, one of his crotchets being never to eat or drink at set times, but as inclination or appetite prompted. Writers on health, however, are unanimous in condemning the system of 'little sups and little bits.'

From ranks yet higher or more prominent—camp, court, senate, kings of men—it is harder to draw instances. Sir George Beeston, an English Admiral at the time of the Spanish Armada, was born in the last year of the fifteenth century and died on the first of the seventeenth. But the Drakes, Hawkins's, Frobishers, were much shorter lived.† Another naval hero—and something more—a Doge, was 'blind old Dandolo,' who, when over ninety, planted, in 1203, the standard of St. Mark on the captured ramparts of Constantinople. Marshal Radetzy and Lord Combermere were military nonagenarians. Our Iron Duke was 83 when he died, but only 46 when he fought his last battle. His brother Marquis Wellesley, who died at the same age, and Henry Petty, Marquis of Lansdowne, may rank as post-octogenarian statesmen, as might Lord Palmerston also: but though fourscore years are a long stress for a politician, these men were but boys compared with humbler examples of longevity.

* Hobbes, however, arrived at the age of 92.

† The longevity of Greenwich pensioners proves nothing as regards those who have had the responsibility of commanding them, while afloat.

In the most exalted ranks one finds, as might be expected, no greater rarity than extreme old age among kings and princes. 'A nice and tender bringing up is no doubt a great enemy to longevity,' and this alone would militate even against such scions of royalty as had no anxieties of kingcraft or state affairs to worry them. But add these cares to delicate antecedent nurture, credit a prince or ruler with a lively conscience, and an urgent sense of responsibility, and surely the chances are unfavourable to his being proof against such pressure on mind and brain, as must in time wear out the stoutest frame and the toughest mental fibres. 'A desire to live long,' one is sometimes told, is apt to conduce to longevity. It did not so prove in the case of those Popes who encouraged such men as Friar Bacon to work out the problem of prolonging life, nor in that of Louis XI., whose ever-working brain, no doubt, helped to defeat one of its own most cherished schemes herein. And indeed, generally, where length of days can be traced in the lives of princes and potentates, such cases will be found to be those of persons of inferior mental calibre, deficient perception of the real objects of life, more or less stolidity, and some degree of insensibility to all beyond their own interests. From this point of view it is curious to examine the character of Lewis Cornaro, a famous centenarian of noble, though not princely, birth. The key, we take it, to the character of this great apostle of dietary longevity, is 'self.' The political offences of his relatives had closed against him the public honours and offices to which, as a Venetian nobleman, he might have aspired. The fault was not his own, and he seems to have had nothing to do but to live an intemperate and irregular life till he was six-and-thirty. Finding at that age that he had already one foot in the grave, he saw that he must change his way of living, and carried out a strict 'regimen' with that unbroken purpose which is his sole great feature. Thenceforth he abode steadily by a diet of but twelve ounces of solid food and fourteen of liquids 'per diem,' and kept a constant watch against heat, cold, fatigue, grief, every sort of excess or disquietude. He succeeded, he tells us, in so getting under his body, that violent passions, if they did sometimes possess him, did not hurt him, as they did his less temperate brethren. The story he gives of his upset out of a coach at the age of 70, and the little effect which a couple of dislocated limbs had on his health, is not uninstructive; but few will repress a smile when he gravely lays down that a fever, which he contracted by adding two ounces to his stated food, and two to his liquid, raged furiously for thirty-five days and nights, and yielded at last only to his going back to his former modicum. Some will ask, was this dieting worth the trouble? Indeed, Sir John

John Sinclair * suggests the inquiry, 'how could the business of the world be carried on if every man were to begin to follow such a system at the fortieth year of his age.' Cornaro had no public cares; and, having but one child, a daughter born to him late in life, few domestic cares. He had an ample patrimony, and, in due time, plenty of grandchildren. He had an unfailing self-conceit. He dabbled—in fine weather—in agriculture, architecture, and divers schemes for improving his estate. He had a kind of mild patriotism, which was a secondary consideration. At 83 he wrote a comedy which his grandchildren and he himself thought very good, and which, he held, entitled him to a higher niche in the temple of fame than Sophocles, who wrote a tragedy at 73. In his last treatise, written when he was 95, he had brought his regimen to such perfection, that, to quote his naive confession,† 'neither the death of grandchildren, nor of other relations or friends, could make any impression on him but for a moment or two, and then it is over.' When having just rounded the goal of centenarianism he died in his elbow-chair, he must have been a perfect illustration of the kinship between infancy and senility. Mr. Arthur Helps somewhere finds the secret of success in life in fine, fluent, unreflecting dogmatism. Cornaro's case makes us suspect that the secret of long life may lie, more or less, in the calmness that is bred of the most imperturbable self-satisfaction. Fairly considered, his example neither makes longevity enviable, nor establishes for it an exceptional footing among the ranks of the great and noble.

It was however, we suspect, the self-complacent, rather than the self-dieting, element, which kept Cornaro so long in the land of the living. Above we cited Fontenelle as a long-lived wit and man of letters. A reviewer in these pages discussing, now more than half a century ago, the longevity of this man and his confrères, attributes it in great part to 'imperturbable self-complacency and to a succession of occupations which amuses without wear and tear of the passions.'‡ Though more or less the Jesuit Lessius, and others, have advocated Cornaro's dietary views, any inquiry, however superficial, will show that longevity is as common in persons who defy regimen and sobriety, as in those who most strictly enforce them.§

---

* 'Code of Health and Longevity,' iii. 49, &c. † Sinclair, vol. iii. 99.

‡ 'Quarterly Review,' xi. p. 412, *note*.

§ Bailey gives, among very many other instances, those of Robert Anderson, a maltster; W. Riddell, a hard-drinking smuggler; and George Kirton, Esq., a soaking, fox-hunting squire of the last century, as men of intemperate habits and proclivities, who lived to a hundred years and more. It is but fair, however, to add that the probabilities are 4 to 1 in favour of sobriety.—Sinclair, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 189.

But perhaps it may be supposed that it is a matter of atmosphere and climate? Agricultural districts may be more conducive to life than manufacturing; the fresh open country than the crowded city; temperate climates than inclement. No such case is made out, by accredited reports on sickness and mortality, in favour of the rural districts, and it is an established fact that a severe climate is not inimical to longevity. 'Rural districts have the advantage of about one in two hundred deaths above city districts, and one in five hundred above the town districts.'* The case above referred to, of two women dying in the same year, one in Drury Lane at the age of 105, the other in Cumberland at 102, goes to qualify any argument in favour of country as against town, and points, if any way, in favour of 'a pre-disposition to life.' In fact, while on the one side may be pleaded the 'pericula mille sævæ urbis,' the overcrowding, the liability to disease and accident, on the other it may be urged, that civilisation lessens the death-rate, that medical aid is more accessible and reliable in towns; in short, that the pros and cons are pretty equally balanced. Hot countries are not more conservative of life than cold. The climates of China, Guinea, &c., ripen life too rapidly, and therefore are far less favourable to longevity than the inclement regions of Iceland and Greenland. Norway has always boasted its large average of very old people. The Highlands of Scotland, the colder parts of Wales and England, show the same phenomenon in the records of parishes. Is long life, then, the result of exercise? It can hardly be so ruled when we note such cases as that of the old Vicar of Staunton, before mentioned, whose utmost exercise for the last thirty-five years of his life was to slip one foot before another from room to room. Doubtless in scores of instances much open-air exercise has been an accident of special longevity: yet records and experience concur in furnishing cases of great tenacity of life under the most directly opposite conditions. Men have lived beyond a hundred years without walking more than a hundred yards a day, from house to office and back. No! it depends not on exercise, nor yet—if we dare breathe it in an age wholly given to 'tubbing'—on frequent ablutions, or strict cleanliness. Witness 'Lady Lewson,' to whose peculiar views on this topic a cutting short of her days cannot be objected. Witness Elizabeth Durieux, a woman of Savoy, whom a writer in 'Notes and Queries' † saw when she was 119 years old, bony, large-limbed, wrinkled, and *very dirty*. Witness, as a nation, the Icelanders, of whom a

* Finlaison's Tables quoted by Bailey, 'Records of Longevity,' p. 51.

† 'Notes and Queries,' 1st Series, vol. v. 390. The reference to the 'Quarterly Review,' just below, is vol. xix. 301.

Quarterly

Quarterly Reviewer says that 'though very uncleanly and suffering much from skin-diseases, and leprosy particularly, their average longevity exceeds that of the continental nations of Europe!'

What is it then? More than anything else, probably, 'a certain bodily and mental pre-disposition to longevity,'* the signs of which may be summed up in the 'mens sana in corpore sano,' in a sanguine temperament with a little of the phlegmatic, and in a strong natural power of restoration and healing. Of course this pre-disposition depends for fulfilment on various circumstances—a tranquil life; an absence from irritability, or provocation to it; a contentment arising out of easy slumbers and 'accounts with God and man daily squared up;' and a cheerfulness engendered by the society of the young. These make old age seem 'as a lusty winter, frosty but kindly.'† And because these are of rare occurrence, rare likewise are longevity and centenarianism. Certainly prolonged life can hardly be found apart from most or all of these favourable circumstances. The reparative power, for instance, what an influence it exerts over life and vigour! The easy temperament, how many anxieties does it throw off, as a waterproof does the rain shower! And the gift of keeping up an interest in younger generations, and retaining a pleasure in youth and its doings, how vast a talisman is this against the inroads of age, how well it masks the mown ranks of old comrades with bright figures of their sons and sons' sons in the foreground! Lord Lytton, in 'What will he do with it?' makes Colonel Morley place the secret of 'being through life up to the height of your century consist in living habitually while young with persons older, and when old with persons younger than yourself:'‡ and Marshal de Schombergh, who was killed, young and active at 83, in the Battle of the Boyne, was wont to say, that 'when he was young he conversed with old men to gain experience, and, when old, delighted in the company of the young to keep up his spirits.'

And this secret of wearing our years lightly affords us an easy transition to the quaintest of all schemes for prolonging life, that of the German physician Cohausen in his 'Hermippus Redivivus.'§ On the basis of a votive tablet dedicated to Æsculapius and Health by one Clodius Hermippus, on the score of having reached his 115th year, 'puellarum anhelitu,' or as others read, 'puerorum halitu,' this singular writer builds a

* Sinclair's 'Code of Health,' i. 49. † 'As You Like It,' act ii. sc. 3.
‡ 'What will he do with it?' b. vii. xxii.
§ Or, 'The Sage's Triumph over Old Age and the Grave.' It was published at Francfort in 1742, and translated into English by Campbell, in 1749.

theory, which a perusal of the work will show to be clear of all guile, that the tabernacle of man's body may be repaired constantly up to very advanced age by the nourishment to the lamp of life derivable from breathing the breath of the young. In this curious treatise abundant learning is salted with no little humour. The plan of an Hermippean college, where old and young are to play 'Blindman's Buff,' is really a startling anticipation of an early chapter in 'Artemus Ward.' And if we might credit him with a deeper meaning beneath his paradox, the author of 'Hermippus Redivivus' might claim to have explored the most attractive of human secrets. For when he interprets the fable of Apollonius about 'apes in Mount Caucasus which feed on pepper, and are eaten by old lions to renew their youth and strength' as an allegory importing that ambitious spirits wear out the bodies they animate unless they are frequently unbent in the society of humorous and diverting people, he is not far from the truth. There is this germ of it in his lucubrations, that they make the secret of perennial youth consist in cultivating the society of the young, and in not shutting ourselves up in declining years with our cares, and fears, and sorrows, or with no other companions, save the similarly aged and care-opprest. Anyhow, they catch a nearer glimpse of truth than any of the so-called adepts and nostrum-mongers. Friar Bacon,* for example, a great man in his age, propounded a life-elixir, which, divested of its enigmatical language, was a mixture of gold, coral, vipers, rosemary, lignum aloes, *the bone of a stag's heart*, and a still more mysterious extract 'out of the mine of the noblest animal.' In excuse for the Friar may be pleaded not only the admixture of superstition with all the wisdom of his epoch, but his obligation to feed the curiosity of an exacting patron.

But even his great namesake in a later age was scarcely less credulous. He was not altogether without faith in the virtues of 'aurum potabile,' 'that golden oyle, a medicine most mervelous to preserve men's health,' which an old Sicilian ploughman mistook for the dew of heaven, and after drinking of it, was renewed in spirit, body, and wisdom, for another eighty years. Lord Verulam, indeed, had a stronger belief in opiates and nitre †—specifics, it may be, less innocent than the Friar's. The nostrum of Paracelsus, whatever it was, did not prevent him from dying of a fever at the age of forty-eight. And probably there was no greater virtue in the method of securing rejuvenescency of Arnoldus de Villâ, a French physician of the thirteenth

* See Sinclair's 'Code,' vol. iv. p. 13. Mackensie's 'History of Health,' p. 207.
† Sinclair's 'Code,' iv. 167. Mackensie, p. 209.

century,

century, which was revived by Eugenius Philalethes, alias Thomas Vaughan, 'the clearest of hermetic philosophers,' or, perhaps, the prince of charlatans, who was born in 1612. These worthies prescribed a diet of pullets fattened on vipers, which, after being whipped, were to be beheaded and betailed, and boiled gently in a pot of rosemary, fennel, &c. A confection was to follow, so richly compounded of emeralds, rubies, red and white corals, &c., that our modern belles would prefer to forego length of days if they could have the precious stones undissolved.* It is a curious feature in the accounts of such adepts as this Vaughan, whom his fraternity believed to be still alive in 1771, that their collateral gift of transmuting baser metals into gold rendered them a mark for the secret ambush of needy adventurers. And so their vaunted immortality may have been no more than a quiet putting under the turf, with throats cut and pockets rifled.

But after the fullest survey of the possibility and means of prolonging life, one main question will present itself, the Roman satirist's inquiry, 'Longa dies igitur quid contulit?'† Why all this coil about a few extra years of profitless labour and sorrow? The graphic picture of Juvenal is quite borne out by daily experience. We are not sure that 'the short and simple annals of the poor' do not illustrate the case even more pathetically than the tragic sorrows of a Priam or a Hecuba. What can go to the heart more surely than the reply of old Mary Campbell to Sir John Sinclair,‡ who asked her if she desired to live any longer: 'Not an hour! not an hour!' or than the misgiving of the age-worn woman, cited by Southey in his 'Common-place Book,' 'lest God in letting her remain so long upon earth might actually have forgotten her?' How few men would care to live their time over again! How many men's experience finds an echo in the noble but saddening lines of Dryden!

> 'When I consider life, 'tis all a cheat;
> Yet, fool'd with hope, men favour the deceit;
> Trust on, and think to-morrow will repay;
> To-morrow's falser than the former day;
> Lies worse; and while it says, We shall be blest
> With some new joys, cuts off what we possest.
> Strange cozenage! none would live past years again,
> Yet all hope pleasure in what yet remain;

* 'Long Livers, &c., with the Rare Secret of Rejuvenescency of Arnoldus de Villâ Novâ,' by Eugenius Philalethes, F.R.S. 1772. 'Hermippus Redivivus,' pp. 162-5.

† Juv. Sat. x. 265.

‡ Sinclair's 'Code,' i. 158. Southey's 'Common-place Book,' vol. iii. 774.

And,

And, from the dregs of life, think to receive
What the first sprightly running could not give.
I'm tired of waiting for this chimick gold,
Which fools us young, and beggars us when old.' *

What statistics can warn against coveting excessive length of life more plainly than those which tell us that 'above half the people over eighty years of age are totally infirm in body and mind, with teeth almost uniformly decayed.' † To have outlived old friends, to have no heart to form new connections, to know oneself solitary, to fear lest one should become querulous, these are one or two of the drawbacks to the much-coveted additional 'lustra' at the end of life. No! in a literal sense there is nothing enviable in extreme length of days, although the inborn yearning and clinging to life may find its satisfaction indirectly. Mistakes of father for son, and *vice versâ*, have ere now led to one or other of them getting the credit of a fabulous old age. To extract truth out of error, a father's life may be continued 'nullo intervallo' in his son's, if the son treads in his sire's steps, and the sire's example has been good and true. In this sense a father may live beyond the age of Arganthonius or old Parr. While he remains, he will not be *de trop;* when he retires, he will leave another self to reap the love and honour which he won for their common name. Nor is this form of 'days long in the land' really limited to those who have families. Example is transmissive. 'No man liveth to himself.' Successive runners hand over the lamp of life, and each, living his own life well, may train another to take up its thread of good works where it breaks off for himself. As Horace felt,‡—

'Non omnis moriar multaque pars mei
Vitabit Libitinam.'

So without canvassing for applause by clap-trap or artifice, a man may bide his time whether long or short; sure that if, at his demise, the world needs that reminder which wound up every Roman tragedy and comedy, its obliviousness will be referable to his having acted his part so well that his successor has learnt to imitate him to the echo. Such a longevity it is no sin to covet.

---

* Dryden's 'Aureng-Zebe.' † Sinclair, App. II. 189.
‡ Horace, Od. III. xxx. 6, 7.

ART.

ART. VII.—*Mission de Phénicie.* Dirigée par M. Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut. Livraisons I., II., III. Imprimerie Impériale, Paris. 1864-7.

IN the 'Mission de Phénicie,' of which we have before us the three first numbers, M. Renan mentions incidentally his having informed the inhabitants of Amschit, '*que l'Empereur des Français avait resolu de faire écrire l'histoire de tous les anciens peuples.*' In the branch of this bold undertaking, which is confided to M. Renan, he has been supported on the ground by the ever-ready mind and hand of the French troops in Syria, and he appears to have placed upon record a considerable number of those archæological data, which, as they accumulate and combine from various quarters, will, we doubt not, throw increasing light upon the ancient and even the primitive history of man. In the case of Phœnicia, by far the most interesting problems offered to us are to trace its connexion with the Hebrews and the Greeks respectively. The latter of these two subjects still remains wrapt in great obscurity; and the most important period of the relations between Phœnicia and Greece is so remote, that we must not calculate too confidently on what archæology can do for us by disclosing merely material remains. A ray of light here and there is all that we at present seem likely to obtain from the researches of the French Government; but each of these rays has its value.

It is, however, matter of great interest to examine closely into the manner in which that congeries of elements was collected, from whatever quarter, which ultimately became the Greek nation; and we cherish the hope that much knowledge is yet to be obtained from tracing the relations between the ethnology and the mythology of ancient races, from using mythological data as auxiliaries in the investigation of race, and, reciprocally, ethnological data to aid in the investigation of religion.

We have found reason to think, that a key to many points of importance in the earliest relations of Phœnicia and Greece may be found in the word Poseidon; a word now growing gradually familiar to our ears under that judicious system of restitution, which is gradually giving back to the old Hellenic deities their true names, and ridding them of those Roman designations which in many cases served as a mark to conceal their genuine features. The Roman Neptune lends us no sensible assistance in examining the name, attributes, or local origin of Poseidon. The scanty records of this god in the Roman literature, in the 'Metamorphoses' of Ovid for example, are, as a rule, simply borrowed from

from the Greek traditions. The reason is plain; it is with the Romans as with the Arcadians

ἐπεὶ οὔ σφι θαλάσσια ἔργα μέμηλεν.'

They were not a maritime people. One little dot of possibly national tradition may be observed. Poseidon seems to have been a rough and rude god; like the god of a sailor-people, ever battling with Nature, and in early times habitually intermixing piracy or kidnapping with legitimate exchange. We are told by Aurelius Victor * that when, in the stormy career of Sextus Pompeius, he had just cleared the gaols of Sicily to recruit his fleet, *Neptuni se filium confessus est.* And Cicero,† in speaking of irreligious and lawless characters, quotes from Lucilius:—

'Tubulus si Lucius unquam,
Si Lupus, aut Carbo, *aut Neptuni filius.*'

Aulus Gellius and Plautus may be cited to a like effect.‡

When we approach the case of Poseidon, his name,§ unlike that of Zeus and some other Greek deities, throws no available light on its origin. Not only is the connexion with ποταμὸς or with πόσις both somewhat equivocal and also insufficient, but it is clear from Homer that, in the heroic period at least, he was not the god of rivers or of moisture generally. With fresh-water he had at that time little if anything to do, as is clearly shown both by negative evidence and by a legend of the 'Iliad.' The mound and trench, constructed by the Greeks in their alarm during the Wrath, were appointed to be destroyed after the war by an inundation; but, while Poseidon contributed a sea-deluge towards this work, it was Apollo who turned upon it the mouths of all the rivers that descend from Ida.‖ Homer was apparently aware that rivers depend upon rain and snow, while he probably took no note of evaporation from the sea; and hence, not only in the cases of the Nile¶ (Αἴγυπτος), of Xanthus, and of Spercheius, but in the case of rivers generally,** he gives them the epithet Διϊπετὴς, and thus refers them to the region of the air.

Poseidon, according to Herodotus, is a deity who came into Greece from Libya, and who was worshipped near Lake Tritonis.†† The tradition thus recorded must, in all likelihood, have referred to one or more of the Phœnician colonies on the Libyan coast. But, before searching for clearer evidence, let us clear the way a little by negatives. There is no sign whatever

* C. 84. † 'De Nat. Deorum,' 1. 23. ‡ Welcker, 'Gr. Götterlehre,' ii. p. 678.
§ In Homer he is not Poseidon, but Poseidaon.
‖ Il. 12. 13-35. ¶ Od. 4. 477; Il. 21. 268; Il. 16. 174. ** Il. 17. 263.
†† Herod. ii. 93, iii. 167.

about

about Poseidon of his belonging to any system of Nature-worship, or of any connexion with the old Pelasgian stock. The ancient religion of the Greek peninsula was already supplied with its own elemental deity in the person of Nereus. Nereus, and not Poseidon, was the true water-god. He was indeed partially thrust aside by Homer, in order to make room for that Olympian system of which (we borrow the sounding phrase of Cudworth) he was the great theologer. Homer never mentions his name; though he gives the name of Nereids* to his daughters, the sisters of Thetis. But Nereus is the true resident god, always in the depths, never anywhere else; reeking with salt, redolent of brine. Poseidon is a truant and an absentee, sometimes in Olympus, sometimes among the Ethiopians for the steam of sacrifice, sometimes taking a contract for fortifications, sometimes seated on the Solyman mountains, sometimes—for the occasions of the war—stalking on the plain of Troy; and when he made his gorgeous progress thither, with the sea-monsters owning their lord and sporting in his train, he came certainly from the depths, but it was from a sparkling golden palace in the depths.† Nereus, again, has this remarkable evidence in his favour: to this hour, if the traveller in Corfu, or as we believe in Continental Greece, is dying of thirst, and seeks to call for a draught of water, he must mind to ask for *nero*, a word, we may add, which never, except indirectly, found its way into Greek of the classic time.

But while Poseidon was thus less than the water-god, he was likewise more. His connexion, for example, with the horse in Homer, though it has been referred by some writers to analogies drawn from water, is certainly not in clear or obvious connection with it. Again, he appears in Homer as the Father of Cyclopes and of Giants, none of whom are marine: he is also the building god, and this function is far beyond any purely elemental character. Much additional matter to the same effect is supplied by the later tradition.

Again, Herodotus testifies that Poseidon was unknown in Egypt, a subject on which we must take him to be a very competent witness.‡ Apollo held the one special place in the affections of the Dorians; Athenè with the Ionians of Attica; Herè with the Achaians of Argolis. There remains but one likely source to which we can refer Poseidon. It is Phœnicia.

Among modern writers on Greek mythology, there have not been wanting those who have recognised the Phœnicianism (so to call it) of Poseidon. Döllinger § regards him as the god of

* Il. 19. 38. † Il. 13. 17-31. ‡ Ibid.
§ 'Heidenthum und Judenthum,' p. 68.

all

all water, but as a Phœnician deity. Both Gerhard * and Preller,† who have treated of him elaborately, recognise in different forms and degrees the threads of his connection with that country.‡ We shall seek, however, to show cause why this connection should be somewhat more broadly affirmed.

First, let us consider the general position of Poseidon in the works of Homer. He is a deity of great force; he was one of the formidable partnership which, in the legend of Thetis, attempts to put Zeus in chains and depose him from his throne; and he was also that member of the league on whose might it depended for its success.§ In the 'Iliad' he is slily incited by Herè to place himself at the head of another similar combination,‖ in order to secure the success of the Greeks; and although he declines, on account of the strength of Zeus, yet he alone of all the deities disobeys a prohibition, and goes to Troas to assist his friends. He is always treated by Zeus, in the Olympian debates, with a deference greater than is paid to Herè, or even to Athenè; and he hesitates about leaving the field of battle, when he is ordered through Iris to retire, claiming an equality of rank with Zeus, and only giving way when reminded of the honour due to seniority, and of the retribution that is sure to follow upon disregard of its just prerogatives. Even then, he reserves all his rights in case Zeus shall not permit the fall of Troy; and the Thunderer is delighted to hear of his withdrawal, on the express ground that to deal with him by main force would have been a serious affair.¶ In the Theomachy, Apollo, as a nephew, declines the contest with him. Yet, when we put to this great personage the question that Delilah put to Samson, and ask wherein lay the secret of his strength, we at once find that it lay in no moral or intellectual superiority. He reposes upon purely physical and

---

* Ursprung, Wesen, und Geltung des Poseidon. 'Berlin Transactions,' 1850, pp. 166, 172, and Note 90.

† Preller, 'Griechische Mythologie,' vol. i. p. 452.

‡ A few facts may be mentioned in connection with this conclusion. Poseidon is one of the twenty-two Phœnician deities of *first* rank, enumerated, according to Philo of Byblus, in Sanchoniathon's second divine cycle. He there corresponds to the letter *Shin*. Sanchoniathon further calls him the son of Pontus. His worship was imported from Tyre into Carthage. Kronos presented to him the city of Berytus, to share it with the Kabiri, the fishermen, and the peasants. There was a Θαλάσσιος Ζεὺς worshipped at Sidon. His representations on Phœnician coins resemble those of the Greek Poseidon. In his honour sacrificial animals were either thrown into the sea or their blood was poured in. There is a curious enactment in the Mishnah (Chulin, ii. 9), 'It is prohibited to slaughter animals (ritually) over seas or rivers,' or (ibid. ii. 8) 'in the name of seas or rivers,'—lest it might be supposed that they were offered to the god of the sea:' as, indeed, Augustine records that it was still customary in his day in Punic Africa to throw sacrificial meat into wells and rivers.

§ Il. 1. 404. ‖ Il. 8, 198-212. ¶ Il. 15. 220-35.

animal

animal force. Agamemnon,* equipped for the array, was in his eyes and head, the imperial parts, like Zeus; it was in his chest that he was like Poseidon. Among the greater members of the Olympian Court, there is no one, except Poseidon, whose ethical and mental characteristics rise so slightly above the level of the mere Nature-power. And yet brute force would of itself not have sufficed to give him a place in the great trine brotherhood. Indeed, we are expressly told that his son Briareus was stronger still than he;† and his title to precedence, relatively to the rest, was like that of Zeus relatively to him; it rested on seniority.‡ 'Never,' says Zeus to him, 'can the gods not honour thee; things would indeed be amiss, if they could subject to indignity the *oldest* and the best.'

Now let us observe how well this position of Poseidon in the mythology corresponds with the supposition of his Phœnician extraction. He is junior to Zeus, the Zeus of Dodona, the Zeus of the Pelasgi,§ of the earliest inhabitants of the Greek Peninsula known to tradition. He had been a rebel against Zeus: the immigration of new and more cultivated or more energetic tribes or groups of men, in establishing a new political ascendancy over the ancient race, had endangered the earlier worship. Everywhere it will be found that both Homer and the later tradition associate Poseidon with very ancient personages and seats of men: with Pelias and Jason, Tyro, Neleus, the mythical ancestor of the Minyæ, and the great Æolid families in general, of whom we shall have more to say. But it is to this very early period, too, that the Phœnician immigrations must be referred: Cadmus, Minos, Deucalion, Melicerta, the names in Greek tradition most closely and obviously connected with Phœnicia, all belong to this archaic tract of time. There can, indeed, be no more unequivocal sign of the great antiquity of the worship of Poseidon in Greece, than the legends which represent his contests at no fewer than six different points of territory with four different deities for the dominion of each settlement respectively. He contends with Helios at Corinth, with Athenê at Trœzen and in Attica, with Herè for Argolis, with Zeus for Ægina, with Dionysus (undoubtedly a younger, or later, deity) for Naxos. Now these contests were chiefly, as is probable, between divinities whose worshippers first arrived as immigrants upon the old Pelasgian grounds, and under whom was effected in all likelihood the transition from the Pelasgian *cultus* of Nature. Or if we go back to the more definite, though less systematic, testimony of Homer, we find that, not to mention Scheriè or Corfu, he assigns to

* Il. 2. 478. † Il. 1. 404. ‡ Od. 13. 141. § Il. 16. 233.

Poseidon

Poseidon consecrated places in Bœotia, in Eubœa, and in Achaia, within the limits of Greece. No other deity is placed by him in relations so definite to any spot within those limits except only Athenè to Attica, and the Pythian temple to Apollo.

But the Phœnician character of Poseidon may in our opinion be not only presumed, but even placed beyond all reasonable doubt, by a close examination of those portions of the 'Odyssey' which treat of the voyage of Odysseus in the outer world—the world placed beyond the limits of Greek experience.

Indeed, unless we are mistaken, the sphere of that experience was very narrow. There is no sign that the usual Greek navigation of the heroic times went beyond the limits of a coasting trade round the bays of the Peninsula and among the islands of the Ægean. It is sufficiently plain that Homer had heard some accounts of Corfu: the signs are, a great mountain lying to the north, a city between two harbours, and a little rock nearly bisecting the mouth of one. But with respect to the mountain of San Salvador, which is at the north-east corner of Corfu, he never could have seen it or he would not have placed it in the centre of the northern side, as he does by saying that Scheriè lay towards the north like a shield on the sea,* of course with the boss projecting upwards at the middle point. And moreover he seems to have taken it for part of the continent, since he constantly calls it a land, and nowhere an island; not to mention that it is plain he believed in a northward passage from it by water to Eubœa.

The ordinary sea passages which we read of in Homer are usually the merest *cabotage*. Ithaca has intercourse with Pylos, and Sparta with Crete. There is not the smallest sign of any foreign trade carried on in Grecian vessels. We hear once of a merchant ship and crew, but it is in Scheriè. The voyage of Menelaus was made under simple stress of weather, most of his ships were wrecked, five were borne to Egypt by the winds and waves, and this too by the route most abhorred, namely, across the open sea.† The only exception, the one great Greek maritime enterprise, was the voyage of Jason to the Euxine; and the proof that it lay in waters wholly untravelled may be found not only in the vast importance attached to the equipment of the ship, but in the cloud of popular and immortal fables, which the expedition did not fail to engender.

In the summary account of his journeyings given by Menelaus to Telemachus, he strings together the names of the countries he had visited as follows: 'I wandered over Cyprus, and Phœnice,

* Od. 5. 229-31. † Od. 3. 285-300.

and

and Egypt—and I reached the Ethiopes, and the Sidonians, and the Arabs (Ἐρεμβοὶ), and Libya.'* In the first clause he is on the route, more or less known, to Phœnice and Egypt, on which Cyprus, already in part settled by the Phœnicians, was a kind of stage; but in the second the mere order of the names is enough to show that Homer was quite out of his depth. And even the road to Egypt, of which we here find mention, was probably known to the Homeric Greeks, much as the overland road between Russia and China is now known to the English: that is to say, as an existing route frequented by persons known to them; not, so far as appears, by themselves.

Such being the narrow sphere of their own maritime experience, we find the Greeks notwithstanding supplied with the products of different countries; with tin, for example, which we may almost say must have been British; with iron, which it seems pretty plain they did not know how to work by fire, for we nowhere hear of any ironsmith, as we hear of a coppersmith, and among the metals cast by Hephaistos into the furnace for the making of the Shield, iron is not included.† They had also gold, which is nowhere stated (as silver is) to have been produced within or near the sphere of Greek experience; and they had both ivory and amber used in architectural ornamentation.‡ Join with this the fact that the Phœnicians are plainly exhibited as the carriers of the world. They then knew, and the Greeks did not know, the outer sphere of the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and the Black Sea; and they were the only people able to supply that basis of coloured fact, which has been conjured into the marvellous phantasmagoria of the 'Odyssey.' Three chief influences must have worked in the transformation: the tendency of voyagers to magnify particulars, for greater marvel, and for reflected credit on themselves; the jealousy of a mercantile community, anxious to keep to its own members a profitable commerce for which a young nation might show a potential fitness, and hence to exaggerate difficulties, and to withhold or falsify all information, such as distances and directions, that could be of a practical character; thirdly, the sovereign imagination of the poet, finding points of contact and combination for heterogeneous materials, and imparting to them the kind and the degree of unity necessary to enchain the minds of men.

Mure, in his 'History of Greek Literature,'§ suggested (and supported his suggestion by argument) that the Phæacians were in truth Phœnicians, and that the name Φαίακες was a parody of the name Φοίνικες. There is no improbability

* Od. 4. 83-5. † Il. 18. 475. ‡ Od. 4. 73. § Vol. i. p. 510.

in the suggestion that there was a Phœnician settlement at a point so favourable for commerce as Corfu. The character given by Homer to the inhabitants of that country agrees in part, and in part disagrees, with that of the Phœnician mariners. Their great characteristic, according to the poet, was to exhibit a preternatural expertness at sea, together with the wealth and luxury that commerce engenders, and yet not to be either an energetic or a warlike people. Now this is in itself a very curious form of character. Yet there is much reason to suppose that, throughout the historic period, Corfu has presented much of this contrast. By its advantages for trade it has attracted to its single town and port races the most remarkable for commercial energy—the Corinthians, the Venetians, the English. But the rural and indigenous population of Corfu presents even at this day a marked contrast to the characters of such races. They are kindly, gentle, stationary, indolent. Dr. Hahn,* in his remarkable work on Albania, has shown with how much reason the modern population of the coast opposite Corfu may be believed to represent those first settlers of the Peninsula, whom we call Pelasgian; and there are abundant signs to this day of a like archaic and aboriginal stamp about the village communities of the island. The undeniably mixed character of the Homeric portrait, and the tinge of effeminacy plainly perceivable in his Φαίακες, may be referable to this old duality, springing even out of the legendary age, and due on either side respectively to the physical features of the country; on the one hand, to the capacities of the port for commercial enterprise, and on the other, to the attractions of the soil, rich, friable, and wrought with little labour, to a race that desires to make easy terms with Fortune, and for the sake of a certain and cheap sufficiency to strike both energy and aspiration off the page of life.

Be this as it may, Scheriè is the border-land between the inner and the outer world of Homer. Here ends, so far as the marvellous is concerned, that tour of Odysseus which begins with the land of the lotus-eaters. The picture of it is probably the picture of a Phœnician settlement: and in any case, if the knowledge of that world of which it is the threshold was derived by Homer from Phœnician sources, it is no immoderate assumption to say that the colour which we find upon it must in all likelihood be Phœnician.

Now the first point to which we are desirous to call attention, in an age of increasing attention to the Homeric text, is this: that with the transition to the outer world of the 'Odyssey,' we pass also into the sphere of a new, or at least an altered, mythology.

* Hahn, 'Albanische Studien,' Jena, 1854.

The

The action of Zeus, and of the Olympian gods in general, is suspended. Apollo, Herè, cease to be heard of. But let us watch especially for Athenè, the fond protectress, the never-failing adviser, the very foster-mother of Odysseus. From the moment when his voyage begins she quits him, even as outwearied gods quit their shrines in a doomed city: in none of his straits is she there to give her aid. She has not, indeed, forgotten him: for while he pines in the Ogygian isle, she pleads his cause in Olympus, and the final mission of Hermes to Calypso is the result of her exertions. Yet she cannot aid him in the storm which assails him before he reaches the land of the Phæacians. It is Hermes, who befriends him against Circe. It is Ino,* the daughter of Cadmus the Phœnician, who supplies him with the girdle that saves his life from the infuriate waves. It is long after he has had the first sight of Scheriè,† after he has duly set the *κρήδεμνον* under his breast, and only after Poseidon has wholly withdrawn from the scene,‡ that Athenè resumes her good offices; but even then in a manner no more direct than by causing Boreas § (the *Borra* of the Adriatic of to-day) to blow. When Odysseus nears the shore at the river's mouth, and is hard put to it how to land, he does not, according to his wont, pray to his old guardian, but to the River-God.‖ When he reaches the city, and sees her temple, then he prays to her;¶ and she hears, but, says the poem, she did not disclose herself to him, as had been her wont at other times: and this, it adds, 'on account of her reverence for her uncle Poseidon,** whose wrath was not yet appeased.' And it is only when he regains the shore of Ithaca, when he is once more in an atmosphere purely Greek, that she at length resumes her personal communications with her best beloved of men.††

In the Homeric system, the five most powerful gods are Zeus, Herè, Athenè, Apollo, and Poseidon. There is a wide interval always maintained in the poems between these deities, in point of living and working energy, and as to the real exercise of governing power, and the rest of the Olympian Court. We have now pointed out that, during the voyage of Odysseus, four of them are almost wholly withdrawn from the scene; the only exceptions being that Zeus is named (but yet is not active) in Scheriè at the border-line, and that Athenè there appears in restrained and subordinate action. In the absence of these four great personages we have other deities, and especially Poseidon, in fuller sway.

To this it may be replied that, while Odysseus is at sea, there is nothing strange in our finding him under the sea-god. But

---

* Od. 5. 333. † Od. 5. 380. ‡ Od. 5. 380. § Od. 5. 325.
‖ Od. 5. 445. ¶ Od. 6. 324. ** Od. 6. 329. †† Od. 13. 190.

the

the careful reader of Homer must be perfectly aware that within the Greek sphere the dominion of the sea is by no means exclusively with Poseidon. Zeus, Athenè, Apollo, Herè, are found to exhibit their power over navigation, by favourable breezes, by storms, by deliverances from tempest; and, strange to say, there is no case in the Homeric poems of a storm created by Poseidon, except the one which assails Odysseus on his way from Ogygia, that is to say, while he is still in the outer world. We have, therefore, first to find a reason for the assumption of this exclusive domination only in the outer or Phœnician sphere. But this is not all. The signs of his predominance are not now confined to the sea. He is the progenitor of the Cyclops, who have no maritime mark about them: he is the progenitor of the Phæacians, who, girt about with the marvellous, are allowed to bear the title Διοτρεφέες, commonly reserved for kings; his temple, again, holds the place belonging to the temple of the chief deity in Scheriè, for the ἀγορὴ or place of assembly surrounds it;* and if it be said this is all due to the fact that the Phœnicians are a maritime people, the very objection goes to sustain in the strongest manner our general hypothesis that Poseidon was a Phœnician god, and that he was, moreover, very eminently *the* god of the Phœnicians.

We have, however, two more heads of proof in reserve, on which we are disposed to place considerable reliance. One of them is the altered and more elevated place which Poseidon holds in Olympus, so long as the scene of the Poem is laid in the outer world. The other is the entry of a new and very remarkable personage upon the stage. And we shall add a remark upon a change in diet, which accompanies the change in the mythology. We will deal first with the promotion, so to call it, of Poseidon.

From the Fifth to a point far on in the Twelfth Book of the 'Odyssey,' Zeus, though his name appears now and then, has no ostensible part in the direct action upon men, and becomes at most an abstracted, otiose, and epicurean god. The Olympian Court is still supreme, for it directs Calypso to liberate Odysseus. We may note in passing that the message is to Calypso, daughter of Atlas, both of them Phœnician personages, and the ambassador is Hermes, a deity who seems to be clearly of Phœnician importation. But it is to be particularly remarked that Poseidon is allowed to pursue his hostility to Odysseus, although that hero enjoys the marked friendship of Zeus and Athenè, and the general favour of the gods.† This becomes more significant when we find that Poseidon, upon becoming aware of the release of Odysseus, complains that the gods have changed their counsel

* Od. 6. 266.

† Od. 1. 65-9.

in

in his absence, as if it were an invasion of his rights.* In the great Book of the Cyclops, Polyphemus and his brethren disclaim the authority of Zeus while they are the children of Poseidon; and, when the monster is consoled by his neighbours, they say 'sickness, which comes from great Zeus, is a thing unavoidable: yet do thou pray to our father the lord Poseidon.'† And the monster does pray that Odysseus may fail of the desired return;‡ but that, if fate requires his going home, it may be miserably, and that he may find calamity in his house; a petition not at all within the province of a mere sea-god to grant. And when Odysseus prays just after in the contrary sense for a safe return, Zeus, says the poet, did not accept his sacrifice, but doomed his ship's company to destruction.§

Further light is thrown upon this subject by the 'Lay of Demodocus,' in the Eighth Book. From the scene there described, the goddesses are absent on account of modesty. Now of these goddesses, five—and the only ones of any note—are apparently not Phœnician: namely, Herè, Athenè, Artemis, Themis, and Leto. The invitation from Hephaistos to come and see is answered by the attendance of Poseidon, Hermes, Apollo,‖ and lastly, of Helios, or the Sun, who had detected the offence by his all-seeing properties, and had carried the news to Hephaistos. Zeus does not appear to have attended; and the grave functions of the chair appear to have been exercised on this occasion by Poseidon. The occurrence gives rise to an inextinguishable laughter among the gods. But, just as we are told at the opening of the Second Iliad that, while all others slept, Zeus could not sleep, for there was serious business to be done, so, here says the poet, while the others laughed, 'Poseidon did not laugh;' but, seemingly as the person responsible for order,¶ he entreated Hephaistos to put an end to the scandal, and to accept the *μοιχάγρια*, or 'damages' for adultery; and finally he became bail, with a positive promise on his own part to pay should the offender fail.** The licentious colour of the whole legend, and the prominence of Aphrodite—by far the meanest personage in the Greek Olympus—ally it with Phœnicia; for the Hellenic tales of Olympian intrigue were commonly accompanied with strict privacy, very different from the shameless effrontery of the Lay. The scene of its delivery supports the presumption; and the remarkable part played by Poseidon, as the one who cares

* Od. 5.287. † Od. 9. 411. ‡ Od. 9. 527. § Od. 9. 551-5.

‖ In the presence of Apollo, as well as in the legends of his feeding oxen, and of the plague in Troas, we may find indications of that stage of belief when he was gravitating towards identity with the Sun in the Olympian system.

¶ Od. 8. 344. ** Od. 8. 356.

for the general credit, cannot, so far as we see, be explained, except by the supposition that in everything Phœnician he had the first or a leading place.

We must add a few words on the storm to which we have referred, the only one in the poems due to Poseidon. In Od. V. 291-4, we have the elements of the tempest, the clouds, the darkness, and that conflict of the winds in which Homer so remarkably anticipated by some 3000 years the circular theory of storms. Now the disposal of these elements is really not a sea-function, but an air-function; and the air-god in Homer is the supreme god. The facts become much more significant when we find that Odysseus (302-4) at once ascribes to Zeus the very storm that Poseidon had aroused. Surely the natural explanation is that we have here Poseidon in the exercise of supreme functions, or what was afterwards called in 'Caria' and elsewhere the Zeus-Poseidon.

Now, as to the entrance of the Sun on the scene. His appearance in this place, with such a marked and active personality, though it is not in absolute contradiction to the 'Iliad,' where just one single word glances at him as partaking of animated existence, for he is said *reluctantly* to set on the great day of battles preceding the morrow so fatal for Troy—yet is broadly separated from its general tenour and movement, and has been treated by critics as a sign of different authorship. In our opinion, without entering into that question at all, it is naturally and simply explained by the Phœnician complexion given to the mythology in the outer sphere of the 'Odyssey,' where it adapts itself to the Phœnician origin and hue of the poet's materials. At any rate, we have beyond all doubt before us a great deviation, not only from the mythology of the 'Iliad,' but from the mythology of the 'Odyssey' itself within the Hellenic world, which, be it observed, is in exact correspondence with that of the 'Iliad.' For the 'Odyssey' generally, the Sun's pretensions to personal and active deity might almost be described in the beautiful language of 'Samson Agonistes:'

> 'The sun to me is dark
> And silent, as the moon
> Hid in her vacant interlunar cave.'

But in the outer sphere of the 'Odyssey' we have a yet more pregnant notice of him than any we have yet seen. It is for the consumption of his oxen in the island of Thrinakiè that the ship of Odysseus, and all his remaining companions, are destroyed in a tempest sent after counsel taken in Olympus by Zeus, who reappears at this point in some exercise of his supremacy. Now, to these

these oxen an immense and mystic sanctity attaches. This is shown by the severity of the penalty inflicted on the crew, though they had carefully offered them in sacrifice to the gods, had vowed to erect a temple of the Sun in Ithaca (showing, we may notice, that there was none there before), and had only sought a meal in this direction when under the last extremities of famine. It is shown again by the marvel, we may say the miracle described by the poet in imagery of marked solemnity; for after the animals were slain, the hides crept about, and the flesh lowed even while distended on the spits.* It is shown, finally, by the delight which the Sun himself says he took, night and morning,† in his oxen. Now this very curious representation has no parallel nor analogue either in the earlier or in the later mythology of Greece; and the hypothesis of a different author for the 'Odyssey,' therefore, does not remove the difficulty. But it is in perfect keeping with all that we know of the sanctity of the ox in the East, which made it for the Israelites, acting in imitation of their neighbours, the impersonation of the deity; and which brought the twelve brazen oxen, under a brazen sea, into the temple at Jerusalem, through the medium of those whom we may call its Phœnician artists. To us, then, the presence and action of the Sun in this part of the 'Odyssey' is of itself a powerful indication of the Phœnician element dominant in the mythology, and thus of the Phœnician character of Poseidon. In using the term Phœnician, however, we both here and elsewhere intend to signify that which came to Greece from Phœnicia, whether having its origin there, or whether only passing through that country as the last stage on its journey.

And now a word upon a curious change of dietary which attends the transition of Odysseus and his associates from the inner to the outer geographic sphere. Everywhere else throughout the poems, mutton, pork, and goat's-flesh are in the second rank as food, while birds, and even fishes—hear it ye oysters on your oozy beds, ye whitebaits wallowing in the mud of Thames, and ye red mullets at your sport in the blue waters of Torbay! are the last and least esteemed of all.‡ But beef is the true staff of life. Moreover, the ox was the favourite, for sacrifice, of Poseidon in particular; while sacrifice and food were one. But as we pass into the outer sphere of the 'Odyssey' we seem gradually to lose sight of this animal as a legitimate article of consumption. In the land of the Cyclops we find sheep and goats exclusively. And it is with mutton only that Circe stocks the ship of Odysseus. In her realm of Aides, Odysseus sacrifices sheep

* Od. 12. 393-6. † Od. 12. 379-81. ‡ Od. 12. 330-2.

for

for the shades of the dead: but he promises to sacrifice for them a cow on his return to Ithaca.* Scheriè, as we have said, is the border-land between the world of experience and of dream, and partakes of both. Here the use of beef does not wholly disappear, but, odd to say, there is much less of it, and it loses the place of honour. In notable contrast with the Pylian feast of the Third Odyssey to Poseidon, only two oxen are slain, with eight hogs and twelve sheep:† and when Odysseus gives what may be called the prize piece to the Bard, it is the chine, not, as in the case of Ajax in the 'Iliad,' of an ox, but of a fat hog.‡ As we go farther into the weird region, the ox entirely disappears from the table. What possible explanation can be given of this remarkable exclusion of the ox from his proper place as food, if it be not that the region in which the scene is supposed to be laid, was also supposed to be under the influence of a religion that regarded the ox as too sacred for that vulgar use?

It is evident, however, that the variation perceivable in the mythology of the outer world of the 'Odyssey' points to some religious system or systems, among which, if Poseidon was great or even supreme for some races, the Sun also was profoundly venerated by others. And this brings us to the verge of a question much contested among the learned, and greatly beyond our power to solve. Are we to understand by the term Phœnicians all the inhabitants of the country commonly termed Phœnicia? Or were the Phœnicians a race of traffickers, Semitic in language and extraction, who had previously been settled on the Red Sea (according to Herodotus),§ with kindred also on and about the head of the Persian Gulph, and who, migrating at a very early period to the Mediterranean coast, acquired a position of ascendancy along its eastern border? M. Renan ‖ describes them as *une race marchande, établie au milieu d'autochthones de race inférieure.* Understanding by *autochthones* simply prior occupants, we cannot but feel disposed to subscribe to this opinion. We know not in what other mode to reconcile the apparent conflict between the Canaanitish and the Phœnician name, and between the evidences in this quarter of a Semitic and of a Hamitic extraction.¶ Again, it may be that parts of these phenomena should be referred to Assyrian influences. In this place we must not dip into the controversy further than

* Od. 11. 29-37. † Od. 8. 59. ‡ Od. 8. 475.
§ Herod. i. 1, VII. 89. ‖ 'Mission de Phénicie,' p. 219.
¶ The results of the discussion are stated in Smith's Geogr. Dict., art. Phœnicia, and in Rawlinson's Herodotus, Essay 'on the early migrations of the Phœnicians,' appended to B. VII. Also Note on I. 1.

by

by a single observation. The Homeric evidence certainly points to a duality of mythology in the Phœnician traditions, which betokens at least a duality of race. If the Phœnician sailors, worshipping a Poseidon, dwelt among Canaanites, who worshipped the sun as Bel or Baal, that state of facts would be one in exact accordance, we conceive, with the indications of the 'Odyssey.'

And there is no doubt of the close connexion in the historic period between the Phœnicians, with their colonial progeny, and Poseidon. Diodorus* informs us that an altar to Poseidon was built at the northern extremity of the Red Sea. At that point was a promontory called Poseidion, and a grove of palms (*Φοίνικες*). Whether this were a mother site, or, as some think, a colony, here is a sign of that connexion of the Phœnicians with Poseidon for which we have been contending. Of this connexion there is abundant evidence at Carthage. In the war with Gelon,† Hamilcar offered a solemn sacrifice for success in a costly manner (*μεγαλοπρεπῶς*), to Poseidon; and it appears to have had reference to land operations, although they included, on the side of Gelon, the burning of the fleet in port. In the war against Agrigentum, and here with exclusive reference to operations by land, Hamilcar‡ sacrificed a boy to Kronos; and at the same time, by pitching them into the sea, a crowd of victims (*πλῆθος ἱερείων*) to Poseidon. This is in the fifth century B.C. Later in the historic period Scipio, when attacking Carthago Nova, assures his army that he has the countenance and aid of Poseidon§ conveyed to him in a dream. The meaning doubtless was, that the foe was deserted by his own proper god; and Polybius says it produced an immense effect upon the soldiery.

It is not to be expected that a theology so composite as that of Greece should present in any of its parts a philosophical or logical precision. It is, in truth, the want of logical adjustment which affords one of the many proofs of its being composite. When we find Athenè and Ares gods of war, Athenè and Hephaistos gods of art, Apollo and Paieon, and (at a later date) Asclepios, gods of healing, Poseidon and Nereus gods of the sea, and when we know that the Greek nation was the combined product of a variety of factors, we naturally refer the different deities to different ethnical sources; and in consolidating the various elements into a general system, if the community was to cohere in peace, no method but that of compromise among the deities could be followed with success. The supreme

* Diod. Sic. III. 41. † Diod. Sic. XI. 21. ‡ Diod. Sic. XIII. 86.
§ Polyb. X. 11. 7, 14. 12.

deity

deity of an immigrant race or family must, under the conditions of the primitive paganism, either gain new subjects; or part with old prerogatives; or thirdly, and lastly, be absorbed by identification with some god already in possession. It is probable that there was much variation from the central system in the schemes of local worship. The curious collections of Pausanias, which take up the facts of the Hellenic mythology in its last stage, as Homer presents it in the first, leave upon the mind the impression of an immense diversity in the different regions of the country; and the idea is a natural one, that though Zeus was in theory the supreme god for all Greece, yet practically he may at different spots have been eclipsed by what was for the inhabitants an older and more influential worship; by Demeter and Korè for instance, as the representatives of Attic Pelasgianism, at Eleusis,* and at other places by Egyptian, or Phœnician, or Syrian divinities. We have thrown out for consideration the suggestion that Poseidon may have been not only a god, but the supreme god of the seafaring Phœnicians, distinguishing them from the worshippers of Bel and Ashtaroth, among or beside whom they lived, and of whose influence there are apparent traces in Greece. There appear to be, beyond doubt, in Pausanias many facts with regard to the worship of Poseidon, which any notion of him as a mere sea-god is quite insufficient to explain, and which appear to us best to harmonise with the belief that the strictly Phœnician immigrants looked upon him as the distinctive god of their nationality, and that when they penetrated into inland parts of Greece they naturally took with him their worship as they went. Of all the districts described by this author, there is, perhaps, not one that tells us so much of Poseidonian worship as Arcadia: while there is none so completely cut off from the sea, and with a population so little versed in maritime concerns. Again, Poseidon, we are told, appeared on the Arcadian side in the battle of Mantinea.† In the same section of that country, according to the local traditions, he was born and bred.‡ But likewise in many of the legends of the Peloponnesus, we see him in possession of attributes or installed in relations, some of them perhaps originally his property, but which in the established religion of Hellas belonged to Zeus. To him is carried over that connection between Zeus and Demeter, of which the mysterious Korè was the fruit: and their joint daughter Despoina enjoys the same awful honours as the Damsel, associated with her mother as a superior rather than as an equal, and worshipped by the Arcadians (so runs the narrative of Pausa-

* See Paus. X. 31. 2. † Paus. VIII. 10. 4. ‡ Paus. VIII. 5. 3.

nias)

nias) as the first among all deities.* Again at Corinth there was a temple in which Aphrodite appeared as his daughter: † a legend which we have seen reproduced in the beautiful jewel work of the Italians of the *Cinque cento.* So distinctly severed was he in many of his attributes from the notion of a mere sea or even moisture-god, that in the course of time a severance takes place, and we hear of two Poseidons. In the Πλοῦτος of Aristophanes,‡ when one of the characters swears by Poseidon, the other replies, 'Do you mean the Poseidon of the sea?' The name too of the Zeus-Poseidon, and a multitude of indications which our space does not permit us to exhibit in this place, show us the traditions of this god in identity or alliance with those which belong to the supreme object of worship.

It will now, we trust, be thought that the result of this examination goes far to establish a previous Phœnician character of the Greek Poseidon. But it also tends, and if further pursued we believe it would further tend, to produce the belief that the connexion of the Phœnicians with Greece was a wider and a far more fruitful one than has been commonly supposed. We venture next to propound two further questions for consideration. The first, whether the Danaan family, which first impressed a national name on Greece, was not probably of Phœnician origin? The second, whether Æolus and the Æolid houses, who play the chief part in early Greek history, were not of the same extraction? We shall only attempt to throw together a few particulars, which may serve to show at the very least that these suggestions may be worth considering.

First, then, the common tradition, which draws the Danaan family from an Egyptian root, can hardly be taken as a denial of his coming from Phœnicia: for the two countries were blended in the distance on the Greek horizon, and the channel of communication with that portion of the world, so far as our evidence goes, was completely Phœnician, while that country was charged at a very early period with Egyptian elements. It seems quite possible that all the immigrations called Egyptian may have taken place at the epoch of the Conquests which go by the name of Sesostris or Rameses II., when the inhabitants of the Phœnician coast were the subjects of Egypt, gave their masters a fleet, and perhaps bore their national designation. Of the Danaan name itself, M. Renan has supplied us with the counterpart on the Phœnician coast. He finds a district in the neighbourhood

* Paus. VIII. 25 and 37.

† Paus. II. 1. 7. More may be seen with regard to the general attributes of Poseidon in Welcker, 'Gr. Götterlehre,' vol. 2. 671-91: in the notes of Gerhard, and in the Article of Preller, already referred to.

‡ Plutus, 396.

of

of Tripoli which is called Danniè, or Dyanniyyeh, and which he regards as a very ancient seat of population; and Pausanias * tells us that there stood, at the reputed landing-place of Danaus from his ships, on the Argive coast, a temple of Poseidon Genesios: a circumstance surely at variance with the notion of his Egyptian origin. But again. We take as a point already fixed, the introduction of letters from Phœnicia into Greece. Now the only Greek person named in Homer as making use of letters or of something that served their purpose (σήματα), is Prœtus, King of Argos,† a member of the Danaan family, and the only member of it respecting whose actions the poet gives us any information. And we find the name of this Prœtus again upon one of the Gates of Thebes, which was a principal centre of Phœnician influences in Greece. Lastly, Pausanias ‡ gives us the local tradition that the Cyclops built Tiryns for Prœtus. Now we know the Cyclops from Homer only as the children of Poseidon, and as inhabiting the Phœnician world.

And we take this opportunity of suggesting that the formula of tradition is an irrational one, which commonly treats of the earliest stone buildings of southern Europe as Cyclopian *or* Pelasgian remains. The Cyclops of Homer is a fabulous being; but the name has a real meaning, and it would quite properly associate with Phœnician buildings. Now it is impossible, as we think, to weigh the evidence of the Homeric text on this subject without arriving at two results. First, that the text affords the means of connecting the Pelasgian name with agriculture; but that construction in hewn stone stands everywhere in connexion with Phœnician tokens. That famous wall of Troy, which so long defied the Greeks, and drove them at last to the expedient of the horse, was built by Poseidon. There are also two occasions on which Homer mentions hewn or quarried stones, λίθοι κατωρυχέες. One is for the building of the Phæacian Agorè; the other is the court in front of the cave of the Cyclops: both of them, it will be noticed, in strictly Phœnician association.

With respect to the Æolian branch of the question, our first step must be to rebel against the authority of the late and spurious distich which tells us of a Hellen as the ancestor of the Greek tribes, of his sons Æolus, Dorus, and Xuthus, and of the two sons of Xuthus, Ion and Achæus. This tradition is worthless in every point except one: that it represents the Æolian as the oldest of the great recognised Hellenic sub-names. But it is common to speak of an Æolian tribe, and of the Æolian dialect.

---

* Paus. II. 16. 14. † Il. 6. 157 seqq. ‡ Paus. II. 16. 4.

As

As to the first, we are not aware of any tribe carrying that name before the invasion of the Heraclids: but there were, like the Heraclids, several houses or families, reputed to be descended from Æolus, a person of legendary fame. As to the second, we can only understand it to mean that earliest form of the Hellenic tongue which Homer spoke, and which was used in Greece at the period when the Æolid houses flourished. With regard to the present discussion, there are two principal questions to be asked: the one, who was Æolus? and the other, in what mythological relations do we find the Æolid houses? If the argument advanced in these pages is sound, the first question is not hard to answer. If the scenes and personages of the outer world of the 'Odyssey' are Phœnician, then Æolus, who is among them, was Phœnician too. Let us for a moment consider how he stands in Homer. (1) Though the poet speaks of Æolidæ, he nowhere mentions the name of Æolus except in the one famous place of the 'Odyssey.' (2) Æolus is the son of Hippotas. This connexion with the horse, which is so intimately associated with Poseidon, cannot be unfavourable to his claim to Phœnician extraction. (3) He is not a deity, but a man, probably endowed with privilege like Tithonus; or as Calypso, if she had been allowed, would have endowed Odysseus; he was beloved by the gods, *φίλος ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*: for him, as a man, some ethnical relation or other is to be presumed to exist. (4) He abounds in sons and daughters, who supply his family circle with six married couples. This representation at once marks Æolus as a prince living by other than Hellenic customs in regard to marriage; but it seems appropriate to the place of a foreign ancestor, to whom several Greek houses traced their lineage. (5) He is steward of the winds, and his dwelling is in a *νῆσος πλωτή*; that is construed to mean either a floating island, or an island accessible to ships. Either way the description, when we remove its mythical glaze, seems a good one for the head of a copious progeny of daring and distinguished navigators, who must have carried abroad with them some traditions of Arados and Tyre. There may appear, then, to be fair ground for arguing that the Æolus of the 'Odyssey' may be a Phœnician personage.

The connection of the Æolid houses with Poseidon has, we believe, been frequently observed, and may be shown by much both of direct evidence and of presumption. Sisyphus, the Æolid,* dwells at Ephure, afterwards called Corinth; and the dominion of Corinth is contested by Poseidon, who obtains the Isthmus, while the rock goes to Helios,† another Phœnician or

* Il. 6. 152-55. † Paus. II. 1. 6.

Syrian

Syrian god. Tyro, whose name affords some presumption of Phœnician extraction, is married to Cretheus, the Æolid,* but bears to Poseidon, Pelias, and Neleus; and the connexion of the Neleids with that deity was in full force at the time when Telemachus found Nestor celebrating his great public festival in honour of the god, as well as when he taught Antilochus the care of horses. From comparing Il. XIII. 206 with other passages of the Iliad,† we find that Poseidon was the ancestor of the house of Actor. But Molios, a member of this house, whom some will have to have been the same with Actor, is the son-in-law of Augeas, whom again the common tradition makes son of Salmoneus, and thus the grandson of Æolus.

In the historic period, as Pausanias and others assure us, there were Æolians at a place called Assos, in Troas, and Æolians held what was considered to be Ilium. Now, there are very curious traces of this ethnical association in the 'Iliad.' For there Poseidon, while he is the bitter foe of the Trojans in the war, notwithstanding manifests a keen attachment to the older or Dardanian branch of the royal house; and when Æneas is about to fall by the weapon of Achilles in battle, it is this god who removes him from the field ‡ and prophesies the future reign of his descendants in the country after the extinction of the house of Priam. If, again, we are correct in the interpretation we assign to the 'Cyclopian' buildings, we at once obtain a key to the legend, otherwise so difficult to comprehend, of the fraud of Laomedon. Poseidon raising the walls of Troy may then signify that those walls were constructed by Phœnician builders. The deprivation of the reward would indicate that these colonists were injured or ejected, or that the worship failed to take root in Ilium; and certain it is that Homer gives us no sign whatever among the Trojans of the worship of Poseidon: while Apollo, who had shared in the construction, but had not been subjected to injury or indignity, appears as their great ally in the war, and evidently was a principal personage in the religion of the country.

In the operation of tracing what is Greek up to its fountain-head in other lands, we have to encounter a scantiness of evidence, due not only to the accidents of time, but to the spirit of autochthonism which made that people so eager to cast into the shade all the notes of foreign origin; backed as it was by a sense of intellectual superiority which produced a positive unwillingness to own an ancestry drawn from the barbarians, and therefore inferior to its own high strain. These tendencies, like everything

* Od. 11. 235-59. † Il. 2. 513, 620; Il. 11. 708-10, 739, 750-2. ‡ Il. 20. 318-25.

else

else that is genuinely Hellenic, we find strongly marked in Homer, whose poems, but for this intense spirit of nationality, would probably have told us the whole story of the ethnical extraction and relations of the Greeks. As it is, they contain (we believe) in twenty-seven thousand lines but one word that throws a direct ray of light upon any portion of that wide subject. It is the word Φοίνιξ in the account given by Zeus of the amour of which Minos and Rhadamanthus were the fruit.* Their mother was the daughter of an illustrious *Phœnix*. Now, there was no individual famous by that name, and the natural interpretation of the word seems to be the national one. The mother of Minos King of Crete was the daughter, then, of a distinguished Phœnician. The later tradition makes her, as Europa, transported across the sea upon a bull. This is in accordance with the Phœnician extraction of Poseidon, to whom the bull was so constantly sacrificed. Again, the statement of Homer, thus construed, is in accordance with the tradition recorded by Thucydides † of the nautical empire founded by Minos.

Again, we seem to have another trustworthy link between Greece and Phœnicia through the Ariadne of Homer. Supported by the later tradition, he directly represents her as the daughter of Minos. And another name supplies us with another point of union. For Dædalus (Daidalos) whose name became the basis of the words which describe works of fine art in metal, executed a work of this description in Crete for Ariadne. Now in the Homeric poems, nothing of this class is produced by the Greeks. Some fine works are supplied from a Thracian source. But the finest are from Sidon. The Sidonians, too, are distinguished by the epithet πολυδαίδαλοι.‡ The Phœnicians carry their commodities to foreign parts: and Greece is clearly connected with them, according to the circumstantial evidence of Homer, through its works of art.

This connexion is corroborated through another medium, that of Hephaistos. This god has a marked place in the Phœnician traditions of Homer; and at the same time he represents the very crown of early art in the Shield of Achilles. But Menelaus, offering to present to Telemachus as his guest a chased silver cup with golden brim, mentions that it was presented to him by Phaidimos, king of the Sidonians, and that it was the work of Hephaistos.§

The Phœnician seed then appears to be well planted in Greece by the family of Minos. That family was completely Hellenised in the third generation; for Idomeneus, who is his grandson,

* Il. 14. 321. † Thuc. I. 8. ‡ Il. 23. 743. § Odyss. 4. 615-9.

appears

appears in Troas among the Achaian kings of the war, with every sign of a perfect assimilation. And when Poseidon, in the 'Iliad,' appearing on the field, is grieved at the death of his descendant Amphimachos, and goes in search of one of the greater Greek chieftains, the one with whom he falls in is Idomeneus.*

The principal point of contact between the Semitic Phœnicians and the Aryan Greeks is, according to the later tradition, that supplied by the person and family of Cadmus. Homer supplies no direct information on this head; but he shows us that Cadmus made a deep impression on the country, since the inhabitants of Bœotia, only one short generation before the Trojan war, went by the names of Cadmeioi and Cadmeiones. If, however, the argument advanced in these pages be sound, and if the personages to whom we are introduced in the outer sphere of the 'Odyssey' are Phœnician, then we obtain from Homer a testimony to the Phœnician extraction of Cadmus, for Ino Leucothee is the maritime goddess who appears to him at the critical moment of the final tempest, and supplies him with the girdle that is to enable him to surmount the peril: and Ino is the daughter of Cadmus.†

Some indications of an ethnical relation (as distinguished from a merely commercial intercourse) with Phœnicia may be drawn from correspondences of name. Whence, for example, came the name of Marathon, so glorious in the annals of the world? It has no apparent root in the Hellenic history or language. But there was a Marathus, lying north of the isle of Aradus, on the borders of Phœnicia. Now Marathon was a town so ancient, as to be mentioned in Homer. And yet, though in Attica, it is not named in connexion with the Attic contingent to the army before Troy. It is mentioned in a manner which, if the outer sphere of the 'Odyssey' be such as we have supposed, serves in a significant manner to assign to it a Phœnician origin. The last stage of the Phœnician experiences of Odysseus is in Scheriè, the land of the Phaiakes. In that land, as we have seen, Athenè appears only by stealth; and after she has provided what is necessary for the safety of Odysseus, she disappears, and goes to the favourite seat named after her, to Athens. But she does not go there direct. She went, says the poet, 'to Marathon, and to Athens with its broad ways.' Now geographically this is a bad route. Corfu, which is well identified with Scheriè, lies north-west of Athens, while Marathon lies north-east of it. It is probable, indeed, that Corfu was itself beyond the sphere familiar to the Greeks of the heroic age, and that Homer was imperfectly

* Il. 13. 206-10.

† Odyss. 5. 333.

acquainted

acquainted with its position. But it is scarcely possible that he could in his mental map have shifted it so far to the eastward as to place Marathon on the line between it and Athens: indeed, there is no ground for supposing his error would lie in that direction at all. On ordinary topical grounds, then, it is difficult to account for the mention of Marathon in this place. But if Scheriè was the stepping stone to the Phœnician or outer world, then the mention of Marathon, as lying on the route of Athenè, at once raises the presumption that it was a Phœnician port or colony, and this presumption is significantly supported by its name.

We have already referred to the metallic work of the Phœnicians as fine art. We will proceed to touch on it in another relation. M. Renan * informs us that the Phœnicians, using huge blocks of stone in building, did not consider that material susceptible of fine workmanship, and consequently finished their interior walls in wood or in metal work, by which the stone was hidden. He points out that in the temple at Jerusalem, the work of Phœnician builders, the whole interior was wainscoted with cedar planks: 'all was cedar: there was no stone seen.' † In the 'Odyssey,' Homer has given us a description of two and only two palaces. Nor indeed do we hear from him of polished stone in the fabric of a mansion, but only in stone seats; except in the case of Circe,‡ an Immortal, and one belonging to the Phœnician cycle. In neither of these palaces does the poet refer to any exterior ornament whatever. In both, he gives us to understand by one and the same illustration the internal brightness of the walls. It was like the splendour, he says, of the sun, or of the moon.§ In one, the palace of Menelaus, Telemachus desires his companion to notice the brilliancy of the copper, apparently in sheets upon the wall, and of the rarer materials, gold, amber, silver, and ivory, used probably for the minor ornamentation.‖ In the other, the palace of Alcinous, he is still more explicit. For there, while the doors are gilded, the door posts and lintel silvered, and the handle golden, the wall-sides were of copper 'all the way from the threshold to the innermost recess,' with a cornice of the dark substance called *κύανος*.¶ And, again confirming the Phœnician character of the whole, we are told that by the door there sat immortal dogs of gold and silver, the works of Hephaistos.

The palaces of the Olympian gods are also the works of that deity: therefore wrought of metal.** It will have been observed

* P. 96. † 1 Kings, vi. 15, seqq. ‡ Od. 10. 211. § Od. 4. 45, 7. 24.
‖ Od. 4. 71-5. ¶ Od. 7. 86-90. ** Il. 1. 607.

that

that M. Renan speaks of the use both of wood and metal: and that in the temple at Jerusalem we find wood used for wainscoting, but metal in Greece. The choice of materials would of course depend in a great degree upon their relative abundance: and it is worth while to note that wood was apparently not abundant in Greece. In all the scenic epithets of the Catalogue, we do not find one that describes any place as woody: nor is any Greek district so called anywhere in the poems, except Ithaca and Zacynthus.*

We cannot conclude without touching upon one other topic which has scarcely we think as yet received any adequate illustration.

The connexion between Poseidon and the horse has been often subjected to hypothetical explanations; but it remains, to us at least, mysterious. Even in Homer it is conspicuous, and in the historic period it acquires an almost paramount force and prominence. Some explain by the Rule of Three: as the sea is to ships, so the land is to horses; and ships are ἅλος ἵπποι.† This, taken by itself, might make Poseidon a ship-god; but a middle term, to say the least, is surely wanting to explain his skill in horseflesh.‡ Welcker and others find a sufficient elucidation in the running waves with the foam upon them, which, he observes, have been called horses and also goats. They have likewise as sheep supplied Ariosto with a noble line in a description of the coming storm:—

'Muggendo van per mare i gran montoni.'

But we are not aware that there is in any early or in any classical poet a trace of this figurative construction, and it appears to us to afford a feeble foundation for a very weighty superstructure. In Plautus we appear to have the ship called a wooden horse, but this is quite a different matter. It is pretty plain that the vessels of the Homeric period carried figure-heads, ἄκρα κόρυμβα (Il. 9, 241), which some suppose to have been at the stern, and which Hector threatened to cut off, probably for trophies, and afterwards to burn the Achaian ships. Now, the figure of the sea-horse being admitted for the ship, it is possible (but we can hardly say more) that horses' heads may have been used for this purpose; and if so, a relation might thus through the ship be established between the horse and Poseidon. But this basis, if a true, would yet be a very narrow one. Again, the use of horses in the chariot of Poseidon would be in correspondence with a similar use by Herè and by Ares. But Poseidon's relations with

* Od. 1. 186, 246. † Od. 4. 708. ‡ 'Gr. Götterlehre,' I. 632.

the

the horse are not thus limited. He gave Peleus the immortal horses. He (with Zeus) instructed Antilochus in the management of the animal.* When an oath is to be taken in his name on the race-ground, the swearer is to lay his hand on the horse. Nor are we yet at the end of our difficulties. It is undeniable that the people most closely connected with Poseidon of all whom we know through Homer, are the Phæacians, quite apart from the question of their Phœnician character. Yet among them we absolutely never hear of the horse; and, strange to say, they have in Scheriè every game of the *pentathlon* except the horse-race.† But the immense interest and importance of the horse-race in the eyes of Homer may be estimated from the Twenty-third Iliad, where he allots to the description of it nearly five hundred lines, and only about two hundred and forty to the seven other contests collectively.

The darkness, which we have endeavoured to describe, we cannot pretend to dispel. We will only throw out, and that in fear and trembling, something less than a conjecture, namely, a suspicion. Even this shall be *sub hypothesi*. If we are right in holding that Poseidon was Phœnician, and that the maritime Phœnicians were a Semitic race, distinct from an Hamitic people of Canaan among whom they lived, and having Poseidon either for their chief or at the least for their special and characteristic deity, *then* we venture a step further. Bel, the Sun, was the great god of the Canaanites. The ox, the royal animal of the East, stood in a relation of mysterious and unapproachable closeness to him, as we have seen from the representations of the 'Odyssey.' Now, so much of the Egyptian worship appears, as we know from the descriptions of Pausanias, to have taken root in Greece, that we are compelled to ask what became of that great and potent element of it which had relation to the *cultus* of animals? It took no root among the Hellenic races. It was put and kept out of countenance by the anthropomorphic spirit of the Olympian system. For the Greek—just as in the case of Peter Bell—

> 'A primrose by the river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more,'

so an ox was an ox, and nothing more: useful for sacrifice and food, passable for the plough. For them the horse was the true royal animal. Now, the knowledge and use of the horse, as is commonly believed, had come to Greece from the East, and probably,

* Il. 23. 307. † Odyss. 8. 101-3.

therefore,

therefore, through Phœnicia. Is it possible, we ask, that the seafaring Phœnicians can have supplied their peculiar god with an analogue in the horse to the ox, which was attached to the Sun-god of their neighbours the Canaanites? or that the plastic force of the Greeks, so receptive of acquisitions from abroad, but given to modify so powerfully all that it received, can, through their poet-mythologers, have effected this substitution? Two cautions only we will hazard in bar of the summary rejection of this idea. First, the inquirer should well consider the extraordinary position of the horse in the works of Homer: the horses born of the Wind-god, the horses exempt from death, the weeping horses, the speaking horses; the animals made along with the chiefs the subject of an invocation to the Muse to determine which teams were the best; and the animals, too, which have supplied the poet with inspiration for many passages of an intense sympathy and an extraordinary beauty. Secondly, we venture with more confidence on the following assertion. No reference to the mere marine character of Poseidon will ever suffice to explain the remarkable breadth and fulness of his relation to the horse. It must come, we apprehend, from other elements of his character, and we fall back upon Scheriè (Corfu) to observe that while there we do not find the horse associated with Poseidon, it is there that the god is most pointedly exhibited in his purely municipal character (so to call it) as lord of the region of the sea.

We cannot now touch upon another curious chapter of the attributes and associations of Poseidon: that which represents him as the reputed father of almost all the violent, cruel, and monstrous characters of the ancient mythology. But it seems to us not impossible that the key to this relation may be found in the rude manners and the kidnapping and buccaneering practices of the early navigators, if, as we believe, they were his special worshippers. We commend, then, our subject to the reflections and research of investigators in the rich domains, so nearly related to one another, of the old mythology and the early ethnology of Greece; simply observing that if the arguments we have used shall prove to be sound, then we have a much closer and more operative relation established between Greece and Phœnicia, and between an Aryan and a Semitic or non-Aryan race, than up to the present time it has been usual on independent critical grounds to suppose. What if it should ultimately prove, as we believe it may, that the Greeks owed to Phœnicia (either as author or carrier), besides navigation, commerce and the knowledge of letters, the bone and sinew of many of their archaic

archaic houses, the art of building in stone and of decoration in dwellings, the original form of their matchless fine-art, and lastly, we should be inclined to add, the noble national institution of the Games?

ART. VIII.—1. *Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London.* By Rev. Alfred Blomfield, M.A. London, 1863.
2. *Two Letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury.* By Edmund James Smith. London, 1863.
3. *Repotrs of the Ecclesiastical Commission,* 1864 *to* 1867.
4. *Statistics of the Church of England.* 'Times,' September 4, 1867.
5. *Increase of the Episcopate, considered in a Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Derby, K.G.* By Charles James Burton, M.A., Chancellor of the Diocese of Carlisle. London, 1867.
6. *Authorized Report of the Papers, Prepared Addresses, and Discussions, of the Church Congress held at Wolverhampton, on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, October* 1*st*, 2*nd*, 3*rd, and* 4*th*, 1867. *London*, 1867.

NO subject appears to us to be less generally understood than the truly Conservative policy of the recent legislation relating to the temporalities of the Church of England; a policy adopted by the leaders of both the great parties in the State, and which therefore may be taken to reflect all the more accurately the real sentiments of the country with regard to the position and duties of a National Church. We therefore propose to examine its temporal state at the beginning of the present century, and to give in a connected and intelligible form those results of subsequent legislation, which are at present only to be gleaned from a wearisome investigation of pamphlets, blue books, and reports, each fragmentary and unconnected, and yet contributing something essential to the complete understanding of the subject.

For seven centuries the clerical order had the almost exclusive possession of the power of knowledge, and at the close of that period, at the dawn of the Reformation, one-sixth of the land of England belonged to the clergy. But the diffusion of knowledge by the invention of printing subverted this special power, and was followed by the appropriation by the Crown and the laity of so large a portion of the ecclesiastical acquisitions, that the revenues of the Church of England at the close of the sixteenth century were utterly insufficient for the decent maintenance of the Established Church.

The judicious Hooker writes, in 1597, in his 'Ecclesiastical Polity':—

'All that we have to sustain our miserable life with is but a remnant of God's own treasure, so far already diminished and clipped that if there were any sense of common humanity left in this hard-hearted world, the impoverished state of the clergy of God would, at the length, even of very commiseration, be spared. The mean gentleman that hath but 100*l.* land to live on, would not be hasty to change his worldly estate and condition with many of these so over-abounding prelates; a common artisan or tradesman of the city with ordinary pastors of the Church.'

Fifty years later the average annual value of all Church preferments was 60*l.* a year according to one account; and according to another the total income of the ten thousand episcopal, capitular and parochial preferments was 500,000*l.* a year. In 1714 there were 2538 livings with incomes under 20*l.* a year; and, in the whole, 5597 livings in the Church of England under 50*l.* a year. Queen Anne's Bounty was then endowed by the Crown with the first fruits and tenths for the purpose of augmenting these incomes, but this endowment afforded so small an amount yearly that until 1788 an income of 50*l.* a year was the limit of livings entitled to receive from it any kind of augmentation; and thus so lately as 1802 there were still 5555 livings with only 50*l.* a year.

Macaulay was not far wrong in saying that while the city clergy of the seventeenth century were learned men, the rural clergy were engaged in loading dung-carts, feeding swine, and toiling on their glebes. Adam Smith writes, in his 'Wealth of Nations,' in 1776, '40*l.* a year is reckoned at present very good pay for a curate, and notwithstanding the Act of Parliament there are many curates under 20*l.* a year. There are journeymen shoemakers in London who earn 40*l.* a year; and there is scarcely an industrious workman of any kind in the metropolis who does not earn more than 20*l.* a year.' The Act of Parliament referred to is that of 1721, enabling bishops to assign an amount 'not exceeding 50*l.* and not less than 20*l.* a year,' as a curate's stipend. Wonderful Walker was probably one of the last and best-known of this class of clergy: beloved by his flock, holding a living endowed with five pounds a year, leaving at his death a far-famed reputation for piety and wisdom, and 2000*l.* accumulated by labour exercised in part while teaching school-children in a damp church without fire in the coldest days of a Westmoreland winter. But *vixêre fortes ante Agamemmona;* Wonderful Walker found a sacred bard in Wordsworth; and many an obscure pastor, with the love of God in his heart, and with

with a 'plentiful lack' of food and fire, had to solve the problem of living in an equally wonderful way.

No historical fact is more certain than the extreme poverty and inferior social position of the bulk of the clergy throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Statists, poets, playwriters, novelists, and historians lay and clerical, all concur in representing the lower portion of the clergy as holding a position which was not menial only because the cloth gave to each individual an undeniable claim to be regarded as a gentleman. The State assumed occasionally the duty of supplying churches where the increase of the population required additional spiritual superintendence, as in the provision of new churches for the suburbs of London; but it would probably be difficult to find one church built, or one ancient church restored, by private benevolence during the greater part of that period. The State also languidly admitted the duty of providing spiritual instruction for the people, and augmented the clerical incomes by eleven parliamentary grants of 100,000*l.* each between 1809 and 1820; and the Legislature voted 1,650,000*l.* between 1818 and 1826 for the erection of new churches. In 1826 there were 5397 parishes with resident incumbents, and the incumbents of 5037 parishes were non-resident, but 984 did parochial duty; and there were 3926 curates. This would give 10,307 parochial clergy, which we believe to have been about the real number. From that time the Church has been left to its own resources and to the liberality of the laity.

Knowledge in the two centuries preceding the year 1800 had not penetrated far below the higher classes. The schools founded after the Reformation provided education for a certain portion of the middle and lower classes, and the Universities received the sons of the higher gentry and the chosen of the grammar-schools, but, according to Burke, only one person in a hundred could read in his time; and if, at the cost to one king of his head and to another of his throne, the educated minority had attained a real control over the Government, that control had been exercised for the advantage of the uneducated majority only so far as the interests of both were identical. The general extension of education commenced at the close of the last century, and Bishop Blomfield entered upon his public career when the effect of that general extension of education began to be felt.

The Life * and the Letters at the head of this article afford the

* We regret that we have been unable hitherto to notice this very interesting piece of biography. Our present object prevents us from tracing the narrative of the Bishop's life; but we cordially recommend the book to our readers. It has been drawn up by his son with good taste and ability, and presents a graphic account of the labours of one of the most eminent scholars and bishops of the present century.

means of estimating the position in which Bishop Blomfield found himself when he accepted in 1828 the bishopric of London, and of tracing in practical operation his opinion, published in 1816, 'that the glory of our Establishment and the secret of its usefulness is the division of the country into parishes and districts of manageable size, each with its church, its pastor, its schools, and its local charities;' and also of considering the operation of his measures for the redistribution of the revenues of the Church, 'for which,' said he, with almost his latest breath, 'they blame me now, but they will hereafter confess that those very measures have been the saving of the Church.'

Bishop Blomfield had good opportunity, as a pluralist, of forming a sound judgment on the Reformation of the Church required to meet the evils of parishes including enormous populations without adequate spiritual superintendence, and of parochial livings held in plurality. Born in 1786, he became in 1810 rector of Quarrington in Lincolnshire, where he never resided; and in 1815 added to that preferment the rectory of Dunton in Cambridgeshire, where he took pupils. In 1817 he resigned Quarrington and Dunton, and accepted Great and Little Chesterford Rectory in Cambridgeshire, and also Tuddenham Rectory in Suffolk. In 1820 he gave up Tuddenham, and held with Chesterford the rectory of Bishopgate, with a population of 10,000 persons; and in 1824 the retention of the rectory of Bishopgate with its income of 2000*l.* a year justified, in a pecuniary sense, his acceptance of the bishopric of Chester, endowed with only 1400*l.* a year. This was his last plurality, and as its enormity undoubtedly strengthened his determination to apply a radical cure to the whole system, if the opportunity should ever be afforded to him, it may be worth while to examine its dimensions.

The bishopric of Chester at that time had the spiritual charge of 1,850,000 persons, the largest population in any English diocese. Its income prevented its being held, except with other preferment; and its residence was so mean as to be deficient in every necessary accommodation. No bishop accepted the bishopric save as a step in his career; and the magnitude of the diocese, combined with the expectation of early translation, usually prevented any serious interest being taken in the discharge of the indispensable functions of the episcopate. The rate at which the episcopal duties had been performed may be gathered from the fact that Bishop Sparke (who held the See for three years) confirmed 8000 persons at Manchester in one day. The living of Bishopgate, with nearly 10,000 population, might comparatively well be left to the care of a curate or two, with an occasional visit in the

the London season, when Manchester, Liverpool, Wigan, Bolton, Blackburn, Burnley, Rochdale, and other towns, called in vain for effectual pastoral superintendence. At the expiration of four years Bishop Blomfield was translated to the see of London, with a population of 1,650,000 persons, where he found the counterpart of his Lancashire experience. In one parish with 40,000 inhabitants, there was only one clergyman. In four parishes with 166,000 inhabitants, there were eleven clergymen; in twenty-one others with 739,000 inhabitants, there were forty-five clergymen; in nine others with 232,000 inhabitants, there were nineteen clergymen. In these thirty-four parishes, with 1,137,000 inhabitants, there were seventy-five clergymen, or one for every 15,000 persons. We quote from the second Report of the Church Enquiry Commissioners.

Lord Liverpool, on his deathbed, marked with his approval the nomination of Bishop Howley to the see of Canterbury, and of Bishop Blomfield as his successor in the see of London; and for the succeeding twenty years (1828 to 1848) the course of the Church of England was guided by the united counsels of the wise and impassive Archbishop Howley of Canterbury, and the energetic and vigorous Bishop Blomfield of London, supported by the experience and aristocratic influence of Archbishop Harcourt of York. The times were perilous. Catholic emancipation was at the door, and reform in Parliament was imminent. The Irish Church was a scandal, and the reform of the English Church might well mean its destruction. In the civil departments of the State abuses had for many years been gradually in course of amendment. The barbarism of the law had been modified, sinecures had nearly disappeared, and public opinion freely scrutinised the working of the political machinery. But in the Church there had been no change since the time of Elizabeth. The rust and dust of three centuries had accumulated undisturbed. The very machinery of the ecclesiastical polity had become antiquated, so that no man knew how to use it. The convocations of Canterbury and York, which once represented the intelligence of the clergy, would, if assembled, represent a comparatively insignificant proportion of the parochial incumbents: and Bishop Blomfield accordingly, in 1832 and 1833, opposed their resuscitation. Nothing less than the united efforts of the two Primates and the Bishop of London could have induced the Episcopal Bench and the clergy to have listened to the suggested reformation; and to the uninterrupted union between these three prelates for a period of twenty years, must be attributed, to a great extent, the fact that such reformation, being effected from within and not from without, took the conservative

conservative form of a simple redistribution of revenue consequent on the changes which had occurred in the lapse of three centuries.

The leading change had been the aggregation of the population into towns, and the relatively increased importance of the northern province.

At the close of the fourteenth century, York was the only one of the ten largest towns in England which was within the northern province. At the close of the eighteenth century, that province contained three, and at the present time contains seven, of the ten most populous towns in the kingdom. Since 1800 its population has nearly tripled, whilst in the rest of England, exclusive of the metropolis, it has barely doubled. It was therefore in this province, next to the metropolis, that the want of provision of spiritual instruction was most felt; and the influence of the Established Church was least, precisely where the population was most active and most dense. The lapse of a few more years without provision for the extension of the ministrations of the Church must inevitably have led to the overthrow of the Establishment.

The principles before quoted as enunciated by Bishop Blomfield, when a pluralist rector in 1816, are the exponents of the measures which were advised by the Church Enquiry Commission in 1835, and ultimately directed by Parliament to be carried into effect. The effectual working of the parochial system is their one aim and end.

But the episcopal incomes required to be adjusted, and the residence of the bishops in their dioceses secured, and the frequency of translations rendered unnecessary, before the bishops could expect the cathedral and parochial clergy to concur in reformation. When episcopal translation might mean ten times the income and a tenth part of the duty, what wonder that the bare rumour of a Primate's indisposition should enable a Prime Minister to paralyse all opposition from the Episcopal Bench in the House of Lords?

The first report of the Church Enquiry Commissioners therefore advised the redistribution of the aggregate episcopal income, the creation of two new bishoprics in the province of York, the union of Bristol and Gloucester bishoprics, and several minor recommendations which were in 1836 generally carried into effect by Parliament. Under the Episcopal Act the five primary bishops receive 50,000*l.* a year, and the twenty-two other bishops 102,200*l.* (subject to an annual charge for first-fruits and tenths), no bishop receiving a less income than 4200*l.* a year; an amount which, having regard to the expenses attendant on the appointment,

ment, the cost of official journies, the maintenance of the residences, the exercise of hospitality, and the contributing to objects connected with religion and charity, was justly considered to be as little as is consistent with the maintenance of the social position of the Episcopal Bench.

The practice of eking out episcopal incomes by holding other preferments is absolutely forbidden, and the residence of the bishop in his diocese secured. No bishop of Lincoln had for two hundred years resided within eighty miles of his cathedral city; the diocese extending from the Thames, at Egham, to the Humber, and comprising the whole of the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Huntingdon, Bedford and Buckingham, and part of Hertfordshire. Bishop Watson held the see of Llandaff for thirty-four years, and never resided within it after the first year of his episcopacy. For twenty years he lived in Westmoreland, planting, building and improving, and writing in defence of the Church of England. His candidates for orders travelled nearly the length of England to be admitted into the Church; and he congratulates himself on the fact that he was the richest bishop in England although in possession of the poorest see. The supervision of the diocese for which he was responsible, seems to have been regarded as a matter with which neither himself nor the public had much concern.

The three Bills—the Episcopal, the Plurality, and the Cathedral Bills—were all arranged in 1836. The first became law in that year, and the two others were deferred.

The Plurality Act, passed in 1838, was the central figure of the group. In 1808, the incomes of half the parochial livings exceeded, and of half fell short of, the modicum of 50*l.* a year; in 1838, half were above and half below an income of 220*l.* a year. In 1808 the provisions of the Act would have required the performance of impossibilities; in 1838 its success just came within the limits of judicious statesmanship. It involved the residence of the clergy in their parishes, and consequently the erection of parsonage houses and the provision of income affording a moderate decent maintenance. It operated, like all other ecclesiastical reforms, as each living became vacant, so that full fifty years will be required to exhaust its effect. At the expiration of thirty years, residence has become the rule and non-residence the rare exception.

The Cathedral Act, passed in 1840, supplemented the Plurality Act, and was the last of the series. Its principal enactments had been settled for some years, the Crown and the archbishops, and several bishops, having intermediately forborne to appoint to vacant prebendal stalls or sinecure rectories; but although it

it interfered with no vested interest, it excited a vigorous opposition. Under its provisions some three hundred and sixty prebendal estates attached to the cathedrals of the old foundation, and the corporate incomes of all canons beyond four in the other cathedrals (with some exceptions), and the revenues of the separate estates of deans and of residentiary canons, as distinguished from their corporate revenues, and the proceeds of sinecure rectories, were appropriated to provide, when they should all be vacated, 134,251*l.* a year for the augmentation of poor livings.

The intelligent opposition to the Bill was the work of Sydney Smith, the witty canon of the Church, who had had experience from an earlier date than Bishop Blomfield of the low position of the clergy prior to 1800. He was the author of the well-known description of a curate, 'the poor working man of God, a learned man in a hovel, with sermons and saucepans, lexicons and bacon, Hebrew books and ragged children, good and patient, a comforter and a teacher, the first and purest pauper in the hamlet; yet showing that in the midst of worldly misery he has the heart of a gentleman, the spirit of a Christian, and the kindness of a pastor.' He had been one of those non-resident clergy who, when Percival's Bill of 1808 compelled residence in certain cases, had been obliged to build out of his clerical income a parsonage-house, where no parson had resided for 150 years.

The canon attacked the bishop personally as the real author of the Bill, and his wit and ready pen made him a formidable antagonist. The two men had many points of resemblance. Both were honest and true of heart, pure-minded, humorous, clever, and possessed with an ungovernable passion for business; both had sprung from the middle classes, and had made their own successes; but they had trodden different paths in life. At the age at which Sydney Smith was a curate on Salisbury Plain and a tutor at Edinburgh, Blomfield was a beneficed rector; when Smith was associated with the 'Edinburgh Review' (of whose contributors he was the most conservative), Blomfield was, under the patronage of the Hervey family, displaying his humour and his talent safely and prudently. At the age at which Smith got a living, Blomfield was made a bishop; and the Government, which gave Sydney Smith his first canonry, gave Blomfield the bishopric of London in the same year.

Sydney Smith's petition to Parliament and letters to Archdeacon Singleton in 1840 contain his argument. The petition states that

'A Church provided as ours now is can obtain a well-educated and respectable clergy only by those hopes which are excited by the unequal division

division and lottery of preferment. Nothing would so rapidly and certainly ensure the degradation of the Church of England as the equal division of all its revenues among all its members. For these reasons your petitioner believes the Bill in question (however well intended) to be founded on a very short-sighted policy.'

In his letters to Archdeacon Singleton the retention to the episcopacy of all their revenues, and the provision of funds for the poor livings from the cathedrals alone, is the main point:—

'The bishops and commissioners wanted a fund to endow small livings; they did not touch a farthing of their own incomes, only distributed them with more equality, and proceeded lustily at once to confiscate Cathedral property. But why was it necessary, if the fund for small livings was such a paramount consideration, that the future Archbishop of Canterbury should be left with two palaces and 15,000*l.* a year? Why is every Bishop of London to have a palace in Fulham, a house in St. James's Square, and 10,000*l.* a year? Could not all the episcopal functions be carried on well and effectually with the half of these incomes? Is it necessary that the Archbishop of Canterbury should give feasts to aristocratic London, and that the domestics of the prelacy should stand with swords and tye-wigs round pig, and turkey, and venison, to defend, as it were, the orthodox gastronomies from the fierce Unitarian, the fell Baptist, and all the famished children of dissent?'

In his Pastoral Charge in 1834 the Bishop on his part says:—

'It is incumbent upon us to do all in our power to render the Established Church efficient in the highest possible degree, and if any changes can be made in the actual distribution of its resources which would have a clear and unquestionable tendency to increase its usefulness, and which are not inconsistent with the fundamental principles of its polity, we ought surely to carry them into effect even if it be at the expense of some of those ornamental parts of the system which have their uses, and those by no means unimportant, as that they should be suffered to stand in the way of improvement, calculated to enhance and give lustre to the true beauty of the Church—the beauty of its holy usefulness.'

On the one hand was the theory that the chances in the lottery of preferment in the Church will be so diminished that a well educated and respectable clergy will be unattainable, and that the change is intended to produce an equal division of all its revenues among all its members; and on the other hand were the facts that in thirty-four London parishes seventy-five clergymen only were in charge of the spiritual wants of a population of 1,137,000 persons; that Manchester, Liverpool, and the manufacturing towns, the coal and ironstone districts, and the shipping ports,

ports, were equally unprovided for by the Church of England; that four-fifths of the whole urban population were growing up without the least knowledge of a future life, so far as the ministrations of the State Church were concerned, and that the rural populations were in half of the parishes left without resident clergy, and, in fact, knew no more of the Church than the Sunday visit of a curate and the annual payment of the tithes might convey to their puzzled minds.

Add to this fact of the spiritual destitution of the large populations and of half the rural parishes the absolute impossibility of obtaining any further grants from the public funds (an impossibility very much the result of the acknowledged inefficiency of the Establishment), and also the necessity of providing from the episcopal revenues the means of subdividing the sees of York and Chester by endowing the sees of Ripon and Manchester, and it was demonstrated beyond all doubt that the controversy narrowed itself to the question whether the continued neglect by the Established Church of its duties, or the provision of funds for their due discharge by applying 'to the spiritual destitution of the Church that which was left for the ornaments and rewards of the Church,' was the course most likely to secure its continued existence. The Canon maintained views he had enunciated in 1820, the Bishop's experience and observation confirmed him in those he had propounded in 1816. All Governments, Whig and Tory, were too sensible of the danger of leaving large masses of the population unleavened by the felt presence of the Church of England, to listen to the claim for the maintenance of ornaments, when existence itself was staked upon the issue.

The Bill therefore became law in 1840, and the sum of about 30,000*l.* a year, arising from the canonries, prebends, and sinecures, already vacated, was granted, chiefly in small additions to miserable incomes; while the future increment of the fund by the gradual lapse of the preferments was to be appropriated as it accrued. But the same irrepressible anxiety which had set aside all Sydney Smith's wit, and rendered ineffective his amusing letters to Archdeacon Singleton, still pressed upon the Government, and so early as 1843 Sir Robert Peel forestalled the future increment of the commissioners' revenue, by inducing Parliament to impose upon the fund a charge of 30,000*l.* a year for the creation of two hundred new ecclesiastical districts in the mineral, shipping, and manufacturing towns, and of 18,000*l.* a year to repay to Queen Anne's Bounty the interest of the sum borrowed to effect such anticipation of the future income of the common fund.

We believe that no other appropriation of the Church revenues could have produced effects so beneficial to Church and State as this

this bold and unprecedented measure, and that the form was that which produced the largest amount of benefit at the least cost. The new ecclesiastical district was cut off from the populous parish of which it formed part, the clergyman was appointed with an income of 130*l.* a year, increasing to 150*l.* when the church was built; and, on this modicum of basis, church, schools, and parsonage-house have been obtained in by very far the largest portion, if not in the whole, of the two hundred parochial districts. The cotton towns received a large proportion of this grant, and it is not too much to attribute to the existence of the Peel parishes, created in 1844, some portion of the admirable spirit in which the cotton famine was met in 1862 by the operative portion of the population.

But although this anticipation of 48,000*l.* a year was a wise policy on the part of the Minister, he was 'a sore saint' for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. This amount in their hands, distributed over a series of years, would at least have softened some opposition; but for these grants they had little credit, nor did the erection of Peel parishes satisfy any immediate claimants on their consideration. The cathedral clergy, present and expectant, resented all interference with the cathedral revenues, fearing an extension of the new system; while the existing parochial clergy had only an impersonal interest in the formation of these districts, and considered their personal claims for augmentation of income to be deserving of primary consideration. And to these professional antagonists a third class was added, which comprised a large proportion of the Members of both Houses of Parliament, and altogether several thousand persons all having some direct personal interest.

This third body consisted of the lessees of Church property. Their interests had been attacked by Lord Monteagle, when Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1835. The Government actuary had demonstrated that, if the Church should borrow money at four per cent. instead of at eight per cent. interest, the margin between the two rates would be available; and the Government thereupon had been desirous of lending the money at four per cent., provided the margin were applied to the extinction of church-rates. The Church, however, was not willing that the church-rates should be extinguished from this source, and the lessees, who were the parties advancing the money at eight per cent. in the form of the payment of fines, had no desire to terminate the existing system.

The Cathedral Act seems to have passed through Parliament in 1840, without observation on the part of the lessees; but they were rudely awakened by finding that the estates of some four hundred

hundred dignities were vested in an undying corporation, instead of being held by dignitaries, whose interest and undoubted right it was to denude the succession by taking for the advantage of their own families as many fines as possible. The lessee for lives could generally choose his own time for renewal as against a lessor, whom, if young, promotion—if older, death—might deprive suddenly of his fugitive interest; and it is known that a bag of gold has been clinked in the ear of a dying dignitary to induce him to sign in his last hour a lease on favourable terms to the lessee. This was all changed by the vesting of the properties in the Ecclesiastical Commission. The appointments of the Commons' Committees of 1847 and 1848, and of the Church Revenues Commission of 1849 and 1850, were occasioned by the efforts of the lessees, and their recommendations led to a change in 1850 of the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Commission, and in 1851 of its practice, which makes that period a well-marked division in its history.

Prior to 1850 the Commission was invertebrate. There was no one commissioner whose business it was to attend; and it might well happen that every person at one meeting was absent at the next, so that the continuous thread of the transactions was not necessarily held by any member. Until 1848 Bishop Blomfield was undoubtedly the soul of the machine; but, when the extent of transactions multiplied and his attendance ceased to be constant, the provision of permanent paid members became indispensable; and this was effected in 1850.

The Act of 1850 provided that there should be three Church Estates Commissioners, without the presence of two of whom no business should be transacted, and it delegated all matters relating to property to an Estates Committee, comprised of the three Church Estates Commissioners and of two other members of the Commission (one of whom might be a bishop) to be named by the General Board.

The commencement of the second 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury' states in few words

'The necessarily difficult position in which the Estates Committee and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were placed in 1850. Their disposable revenues anticipated for some years; the great body of the lessees opposing the Commission as antagonistic to their interest, and the parochial clergy dissatisfied, inasmuch as the grants, although amounting to 80,000*l.* a year, were quite inadequate to the relief of the general spiritual destitution; an object which required, at least, 400,000*l.* a year, in addition to a large amount of capital for the provision of parsonage houses. The Estates Committee, consisting of the Earl of Chichester and Sir John Lefevre, appointed by the Crown, and Mr.

Mr. Goulburn, appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the additions of Bishop Blomfield and of Sir James Graham, appointed by the Board, entered, under these circumstances, upon their labours at the close of 1850.'

Peace with the lessees was indispensable, and in the Session of 1851 terms of compromise were agreed: and an Act was passed affording to all the episcopal and capitular corporations the opportunity of ceasing to renew beneficial leases by dealing with the lessees either for the purchase of the leasehold interests or for the sale of their reversionary estate, subject to the condition that the improvement in value arising from such transactions should be applied to the purposes of the common fund.

The fact of the discussion had rendered the leasehold interests scarcely marketable, and the progress, little as it was, effected in relieving the spiritual destitution of the country, had made it clear that all the means obtainable from Church property would be required if the parochial system were to be established in its integrity. The lessees obtained favourable terms, and the improved value consequent on the cessation of the system of taking fines became applicable to the purposes of the common fund. The selling and buying of real property on the part of the Ecclesiastical Commission seems to have been consequent on this compromise, the transactions affording to the lessees lands they want, while reserving for the Church such as, from special circumstances, it is deemed desirable to retain.

Bishop Blomfield was undoubtedly the promoter of this Act, and at this point his personal efforts for the ultimate establishment in each parish of 'its church, its pastor, its schools, and local charities' became secondary. The principles he had so long and laboriously advocated had triumphed, and only required time for the full development of their results.

The Memoir of Bishop Blomfield sums up the results of the Episcopal, Plurality, and Cathedral Acts, as effected through the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to the year 1862, as follows:—

'By equalising the incomes of the bishops it has made translations unnecessary, and has set free for the benefit of the parochial clergy benefices and dignities previously held in commendam; by the rearrangement of dioceses it has made efficient episcopal superintendence a possibility, and in the instances of Ripon and Manchester it has at least established the principle that increase of population requires increase of bishops. It has almost entirely removed the crying evils of pluralities and non-residence, and if its main object, the increased provision for the pastoral superintendence and religious instruction of the people, has not been attained to anything like the extent which its original projectors anticipated, still what has been effected in this way

is

is by no means inconsiderable. In the course of twenty-five years a sum of 108,500*l.* has been added to the annual incomes of the parochial clergy, representing, if capitalised, a sum of more than three millions sterling; and this has been so apportioned, that while 1100 existing benefices have been augmented, 288 new districts have been formed with an aggregate income of 37,640*l.* and an aggregate population of 922,692, the Commission also supplying in many cases benefactions for church and parsonage houses. The moral and religious influence represented by these figures is no small thing. Lastly, the Commission has done what it has done without taxing one class of the clergy in support of another—without diverting Church revenues in the slightest degree from their proper objects—without appealing for aid to unwilling legislation, and without diminishing the usefulness and true dignity of the Establishment which it has remodelled; and it has not only not checked, but has very remarkably stimulated, the liberality of private churchmen, for the objects at which it has professed to aim.'

But while the contest with the lessees had gradually subsided, another grievance had made itself felt.

The Cathedral Bill of 1840 originally proposed to endow a common fund, all the revenues of which should be distributed over the whole kingdom with regard simply to the urgency of each case of spiritual destitution, but in its passage through Parliament a local claim to adequate endowment, before the revenues so arising should be appropriated elsewhere, was given to each parish whence any tithe accrued to the fund. Where tithes fell into possession the revenues were applied to the spiritual wants of the parish, and only the residue carried to the common fund for general distribution: but the revenues arising from all other property were distributable for the general purposes of the fund. But the clergy of the parishes where other property was situated could see no distinction between tithes and such other property, more especially where large amounts accrued to the Commission from the working of minerals or from house property; they thought that the masses of population brought together within a parish, as miners or as inhabitants of houses, had as good a claim to priority as the inhabitants of parishes affording revenue from tithe; and that such priority should take immediate effect: and when, in 1858, a Committee of the House of Lords investigated the extent of spiritual destitution, sufficient analogy between tithe revenue, and mineral, building, and other income was found to induce the Legislature in 1860 to extend the local claim from tithe revenues alone to every kind of income arising to the Commission from real property.

The letters previously quoted state:—

'The purpose of the common fund to provide for general spiritual destitution,

destitution, with a limitation in favour of tithe only, was changed by this enactment into the provision, in the first instance, for the wants of the place where property was situated, and the appropriation only of the remaining balance to the general spiritual destitution.'

This fundamental change in the directions of Parliament rendering indispensable a corresponding change in the practice of the Commission and an earlier recognition of the local claims, it ceased to be the most unpopular body in the kingdom. It had been working on the principle of recovering to the Church, at the end of the existing leases, the full revenue of the property leased, and of distributing that revenue when it accrued, and under that system the existing parochial clergy had no interest in any property vested in the Commission until the expiration of each lease. The subdivisions of the populous parishes, and benefactions offered by the laity, occupied intermediately any other disposable funds.

Reading the Commissioners' practice by this light the comparatively small amount of grants between 1844 and 1862, and the five millions of capital, flowing like water in a thirsty land, subsequently granted for the seven years from 1862 to 1869 becomes intelligible; and comparative popularity is obtained because the existing parochial clergy are at once benefited. A corresponding diminution of the ultimate resources was the inevitable consequence; but we think, with Sir R. Peel in 1843, that it may be more important to meet the present necessity than to provide for the future contingency.

Many bishops and chapters took advantage of the Act of 1851, enabling them to put an end to the system of beneficial leases, subject to the condition that the improvement derivable from any transaction should be given over to the common fund; but some chapters would not have any dealings under it, preferring to postpone the realisation of the improved value and to continue the acknowledged waste of Church property by granting leases in consideration of the payment of fines. Others mistrusted their capacity to deal with their lessees, and requested the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to effect a commutation of their capitular property by paying to them temporarily a fixed income and endowing them, as soon as might be, with estates adequate to provide permanently the amount of such fixed income. The then Dean of Carlisle is said to have initiated this mode of dealing in 1852, and it was subsequently carried out in many cases under orders in council; and in several chapters, Carlisle, York, Peterborough, Chichester, Gloucester, Canterbury (and it may be others), the permanent capitular estates have been provided.

The

The present position with respect to the cessation of the renewal of leases on payment of fines we believe to be that, as regards the bishops, there may be five or six appointed before 1850 which continue to renew beneficial leases, and that on the vacation of each see such renewals must necessarily cease; that as regards the chapters, some eight or ten continue to take fines, and that there is no period fixed by the Legislature for the termination of the practice; and that, as regards the dignities, nearly all have become vacant since 1840: so that the lapse of a few years will make that system a memory instead of a living fact; unless it is allowed to be continued by the recusant chapters. The system of taking fines might have been a convenient mode of preserving Church property from the grasp of King or courtiers, or of providing dignitaries in the first instance with a large sum of money in a lump; but it certainly had no effect in preventing the sale of Church leaseholds in 1650, for the surveys of the Long Parliament and the sale deeds to the purchasers still exist. The restoration of the King was followed by the restoration of the episcopal and capitular estates; but the fact of their being held on lease had no effect whatever in preventing their appropriation and sale by the Parliament.

We now can extend the summary before quoted from the memoirs of 1862 to the end of 1868: inasmuch as the Commissioners have pledged themselves to a particular expenditure during the quinquennial period of which the coming year is the last.

The annual grants which in that summary in 1863 are stated at 108,500*l.* must next year exceed 280,000*l.*; the capital value invested by the Commissioners must be increased from the three millions therein mentioned to ten millions; the 1388 benefices therein stated to have been augmented or created must then be nearly 2500 in number. There will then be no benefice with a population of 4000 persons without an income of at least 300*l.* a year, except where a private patron neglects to provide one half of the increase required to bring the income up to that amount. The 1,137,000 persons who in 1831 might be found in thirty-four parishes in the diocese of London, under the charge of seventy-five clergy, can only now be enumerated by the addition of the inhabitants of the eighty most densely-populated parochial districts in that diocese, and these are already under the charge of 226 clergymen, exclusive of those attached to missions; and a similar improvement has been effected in every one of the populous parishes in the kingdom, except a very few where the negligence of the private patron intervenes; the Episcopal Bench has been placed in a better position with regard

regard to its dioceses, and has retained the whole of the income it enjoyed in 1836; the chapters that have completed their arrangements receive from their real property in a better form all that they could have received under the system of taking fines; and the parochial clergy have the benefit of eight millions of money derived from the better management of Church property and of two millions added by the benefactions of the public.

If knowledge be power to the extent only of the ignorance of the uneducated, that ignorance has now to a great degree ceased to exist, and influence can be effectively exercised only through intelligent conviction. The voice of authority speaking from antiquity cannot be accepted as conclusive in an age which recognises the fact that we are the true ancients living a life later by many centuries, and endowed with a larger experience and a wider range of knowledge. Dean Colet wrote 300 years since: 'If a man accept the Bible and the Apostles' Creed he may leave divines to dispute about the rest,' and Erasmus maintained 'that science can never truly conflict with Christianity;' and whether the Church of England be of divine appointment or be a State institution, whether the highest Church doctrine or the lowest school of evangelical teaching be taught within it, in any case the parochial system affords the most ready means of impressing the minds of the masses of the population. So much having been done, what remains to be effected?

The statistics of the Church of England quoted at the head of this article adopt the number of persons in each parochial district as the basis of classification, distinguishing by that means the rural from the urban populations with an intermediate class of such parishes as may lie within one or the other division.

There are, it seems, 12,888 parochial districts in England and Wales, of which 10,398 contain less than 2000 persons, and are almost wholly rural parishes in which the population lies dispersed over an area sometimes very considerable. These parishes comprise seven and a half millions of people in the charge of 12,500 clergymen, one to each 600 persons; and in this class the difficulty is not so much any deficiency in the number of the clergy as the large proportion endowed with insufficient incomes.

The urban parishes, with more than 4000 population in each, are only 1347 in number; but they contain ten million persons, or nearly one half of the whole population of the kingdom, and the inhabitants of each parish are concentrated in a few streets. These ten millions are divided into two classes: one of five millions included in 465 most largely populated parishes in the

 charge

charge of 1154 clergy, one to 4300 persons; and the other of five millions in 882 other parishes in the charge of 1814 clergy, one to 2750 persons; and in these two divisions the minimum income of a parochial incumbent is now (with very few exceptions) 300*l.* a year.

The parishes with populations between 4000 and 2000 persons are 1143 in number, containing three-and-a-half millions of people, in the charge of 1558 clergy, or one to each 2000 persons; but in this class there are many parochial incumbents with incomes of 150*l.* a year, and some with a mere pittance.

By the aid of this classification of parishes we may arrive at an approximate idea of the amount of augmentations still required to bring the incomes of the parochial clergy to a minimum of 300*l.* a year, wherever the parochial population exceeds 500 persons.

The Report of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1864 states that at least 330,000*l.* a year would be required to raise, according to their rules, the incomes of all livings with 500 population to 300*l.* a year, and as they will between 1864 and 1869 have granted about 130,000*l.* a year, there remains to be provided for this portion of the parochial livings 200,000*l.* a year.

The further subdivision of the parochial districts with the largest populations is not included in this estimate; and having regard to the elaborate statements in support of the Bishop of London's Fund, the 465 most largely populated parishes must be provided with at least 500 additional clergy, so as to reduce the average under the charge of each clergyman from 4300 to about 3000 persons. Assuming half of these to be curates and half incumbents, the cost of this addition would be 100,000*l.* a year; so that 300,000*l.* a year is the least possible amount requisite to bring the provision of clergy into reasonable proportion with the population, both as to their number and the provision of a minimum income of 300*l.* a year. And in addition, a large number of parsonage houses require to be provided.

These statistics also inform us that of the 2490 livings with thirteen-and-a-half millions of inhabitants, only 657 are in private patronage; while the advowsons of no less than 5746 out of the 10,398 rural parishes belong to private owners (of whom more than one thousand are clergymen). In the urban parishes the commercial value of the advowson of a living of 300*l.* is so small, that the private patron, if disinclined to provide one half of the addition required to raise it to 300*l.* a year, will very generally resign the patronage to a public patron, so that this section of private patronage requires little consideration. But in a large number of the 5746 rural livings, the patron is the

the landowner of the parish; and it is to be feared that a large proportion of these livings have incomes below 300*l.* a year, the impropriator frequently possessing both rectorial and vicarial tithe. If the diocese of York be taken as a fair average of the whole kingdom, it would appear that the incomes of only one fourth of the livings in private patronage exceed 300*l.* a year, and that one fifth of such livings have incomes below 100*l.* a year.

When Lord King, in 1835, proposed to move for returns of parishes where bishops had the appropriate tithes, Bishop Blomfield gave notice of extending the motion to parishes where the tithes belonged to lay impropriators; and the proposal was dropped. The same two classes are now again face to face; but the ecclesiastical corporations occupy a different position, for they call on the lay impropriators to follow their example in securing a reasonable remuneration to the parochial incumbent.

It is enough to reiterate the fact with respect to these livings in private patronage, for it will be impossible for the leaders of clerical opinion to avoid, if even they desired it, taking an active part in their augmentation; and that will necessarily be a work of time and of gradual amelioration. There is the less need to press the subject when we consider the great liberality of the laity in response to the work effected by the Church itself. Eight millions of money granted by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have been supplemented by two millions, freely added by private liberality. The Bishop of London's Fund has raised upwards of 300,000*l.*; the Pastoral Aid and Additional Curates' Societies assist in maintaining 1000 curates; the charitable institutions in favour of the clergy are numerous and well supported; and the voluntary contributions of the laity probably reach 300,000*l.* yearly, exclusive of foreign missionary objects. Honourable mention should also be made of Queen Anne's Bounty Fund, which by granting annually the first fruits and tenths, increases the income of the parochial clergy to the extent yearly of 300*l.* or 400*l.* a year, and evokes from the laity contributions of at least equal amount. The increase of clerical income from these grants during the period from 1714 closely approximates to the increase effected during the seven years from 1862 to 1869 by the Ecclesiastical Commission. New churches to the number of nearly 3000 have been built at a cost of ten millions of money since the State has ceased to contribute to such objects, and schools almost invariably spring up where requisite. The clergy bear the greater part of the labour of obtaining churches, schools, and parsonages, but the

cost is very generally provided by subscription, and all experience leads to the conclusion that increased efficiency may fairly calculate on proportionately increased support from the laity.

It may be assumed that the redemption of the pledge given in 1864 by the Ecclesiastical Commission as to its expenditure to 1869, will not exhaust its disposable revenues, but no indication has been given of the amount likely to be available after 1869; possibly such amount cannot be forecast with any certainty. The Act passed in 1866 transfers to their funds the discharge of the portion of their expenses heretofore defrayed by the public, and also directs them to consider the claims of the minor canons, schoolmasters, and other officers of the cathedral churches, upon any income arising from capitular property: and there is no assurance against further legislative changes. The greater part of the common fund must also arise from property accruing at uncertain periods, dependent on the failure of the lives in the leases; and the before-mentioned anticipation of the local claims must naturally render uncertain the ultimate disposable results. The story of the proposed sale of the Finsbury Prebend Estate in 1840 may well illustrate the tendency to anticipate future expectations. The Bishop of London carried in that year through the House of Lords a bill by which, in consideration of 200,000*l.* to be paid to form a fund for the endowment of new churches, the interest of the Ecclesiastical Commission in the Finsbury Estate said to be worth 50,000*l.* a year (and falling into the possession of the commissioners before these pages are printed), would have been sold to the City of London. For this sum of 200,000*l.* in 1840, 50,000*l.* a year from 1868 would have been sacrificed. 200,000*l.* to be received in 1840 seemed of more consequence to that generation than 50,000*l.* a year accruing in 1868. The consideration of the local claims at the failure of the outstanding leasehold terms was the true, though impracticable, theory (for until the end of each lease no revenues could have been available for augmentations); and the balance requires to be firmly held between undue delay in their consideration and unnecessary diminution, by their immediate satisfaction, of the residue available for grants in favour of large populations, or to meet benefactions.

We have traced the gradual improvement of the position of the Church of England, from its lowest financial condition in the beginning of the eighteenth century, through the intervening period, to the time when the three Acts of Parliament promoted by Bishop Blomfield resettled the episcopacy, abolished pluralities, and provided means for the gradual subdivision of overgrown

grown parishes, and the augmentations of the poorer livings; and its position at the present time, when those Acts may be regarded as in full operation. We have found that the bishoprics were resettled, so that it became possible for the bishops to discharge their episcopal duties of supervision; and as a matter of fact the cry for the abolition of bishops has been succeeded by a very generally expressed opinion that their number should be increased. The diocese of London had, by a series of contradictory enactments, been left so that at any moment its population might exceed three millions of persons—and it still contains more than two millions and a half. Nor is it the mere weight of numbers in this diocese which constitutes the difficulty. Its bishop cannot escape taking part in the general direction of Church policy, and the diocese should, theoretically, be one of the least, instead of the most, extensive, in order to afford leisure for the control of the great Church institutions, and the careful consideration of the secular interests of the Church.

How do the facts that we have described bear upon the question of the increase of the Episcopate? The recent debates in Parliament on this subject were somewhat unreal, and therefore uninteresting. Lord Lyttelton's bill, as it was first introduced, recommended itself by its promise to take nothing from the common fund of the Commissioners. There remained, therefore, no source from which the endowments could arise except private benevolence. But the sum required was enormous. Not less than 300,000*l.* must be provided for the incomes of the three sees of Southwell, St. Alban's, and Cornwall, even with a lower amount of income than that at which the existing sees were adjusted. Add to this a sum of 40,000*l.* for three houses of residence, and the scheme seems absolutely hopeless. Private benevolence might have been trusted for this and for more; but not against such competing claims. With beneficed clergy unhoused and half-endowed; with the class of curates that the Curates' Augmentation Fund is to deal with—perpetual curates in fact, though terminable in theory; that layman must indeed have been a lover of episcopacy who could find it in his heart to bestow on the foundation of one see what might fortify many a parish or gladden with a doubled income the desponding breasts of thirty curates. A clause soon crept in to enable the Ecclesiastical Commission to move as soon as one-half of an endowment was provided. No sooner did this clause appear than a large party took alarm at the sight of nimble fingers all too near the locks of the Commissioners' coffers. Amidst strong protests, opposed

opposed by one archbishop and some bishops, but supported by the other and some bishops, the clause passed the House of Lords, but there ended its brief triumph. No one said a word in its defence before the more awful tribunal of the Lower House; it disappeared, and the bill, restored to its purely eleemosynary character, returned to the House of Lords to be abandoned. The good faith of the promoter cannot be questioned, but no one hoped that the bill would ever become a working measure. The utmost expectation was that Parliament might affirm by it the principle that an increase of the episcopate was a thing desirable; and in that point of view it is to be regretted, perhaps, that the measure was not passed.

And, in truth, the question has been advanced by those debates; but questions are apt to march in a path of their own. It became pretty plain that, if the bishops want an increase of the episcopate, the country will be very happy to aid them by legislation, provided it is done at the expense of the episcopate, or at the joint expense of bishops and chapters. From no other source does there appear a hope of speedy success. Private benevolence pours at the feet of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners about a quarter of a million yearly, in the hope of responsive grants; but all this is offered to put a roof over the heads of incumbents, to give them and their children bread, and to endow new districts that populations neglected hitherto may have spiritual care. Amidst all this generosity, continued now for some years and rather tending to increase, there is hardly a symptom of a desire to give to the foundation of new sees. Years ago one such proposal was made, but the heart of the profferer was fuller than his purse; and when legislation was about to make the thing possible the means had disappeared. Benevolent people, delighting to encourage many little parsons, give and never tire; but their imagination has not yet taken in the possibility of bringing into existence a whole bishop. As to the Common Fund, it is practically closed against such a demand, and we cannot pretend to regret it.

The pamphlet by Chancellor Burton of Carlisle suggests in detail a mode by which seven new bishoprics with attendant chapters may be endowed. The author, we believe, propounded, in 1836, a scheme for the augmentation of poor livings by imposing a tax upon the wealthier preferments, thereby laying himself open to the charge of reducing the parochial incomes to an insufficient level. That proposal was superseded by those of Bishop Blomfield which we have narrated, but the long-continued attention which the Chancellor has bestowed upon the subject

subject and the ingenuousness of his scheme entitle his suggestions to our gravest consideration although we differ materially from his conclusions.

After discussing the inexpediency of creating suffragan bishops, and noticing the fact that the existing bishoprics and chapters, having been maintained mainly by the proceeds of rectories held by miserably-paid vicars and perpetual curates, cannot claim to create new bishoprics and chapters out of the revenues of such property, but must leave them for the augmentation of the parochial livings, Chancellor Burton advises the creation of seven new bishoprics and chapters, at a cost of 8000*l.* a year each. This amount is to be in part provided by the reduction, on the next vacation, of the incomes of all the bishoprics, save that of Oxford and of those which now receive 4200*l.* a year, and by this means 17,000*l.* a year is obtained. The following are the details of his scheme, slightly abridged :—

'15,000*l.* per annum have been assigned for the support of the see of Canterbury. This is a sum, to most men's minds, not required in even that exalted station. This amount could hardly have suggested itself to the government of the day as a permanent settlement; and, it is likely that the excessive amount the archiepiscopal revenue had reached at the time caused it to be dealt with comparatively; and, 15,000*l.* would appear a great descent from thence, and not more than it might be prudent to name in the first instance. The archbishop of Canterbury, as ministerial head of the Church, ought to have an income adequate to the condition of an English nobleman; and I consider that 11,000*l.* would enable him to maintain it, allowing 1000*l.* for extraordinary official expenses. The archbishop of York has 10,000*l.* per annum. This sum may be reduced to 8000*l.*, and still keep a fair proportion, when so reduced, in respect of the higher station of the other archbishopric. The see of London has been already dealt with. [He reduces it from 10,000*l.* to 6000*l.*] The bishop of Durham has 8000*l.*: I propose a reduction to 6000*l.* An income of 7000*l.* has been appointed on the next avoidance of the see of Winchester: considering all the circumstances of this case, the sum of 5500*l.* seems reasonable. The sees of Bath and Wells, Exeter, Gloucester and Bristol, Lincoln, Rochester, Salisbury, and Worcester, have each of them endowments of 5000*l.*: they may be reduced to 4200*l.* each; a sum which Parliament has thought sufficient for some others. The see of Ely has 5500*l.*, and that of Oxford 5000*l.*: each of these may be set at 5000*l.*, in consideration of their more prominent position and character, as containing the two universities within their respective limits. I find seven other sees, those of Carlisle, Chester, Lichfield, Norwich, Peterborough, Ripon, and St. David's, with 4500*l.* for each one: there can be no reason for their not being placed at the amount of 4200*l.* These reductions will produce about 17,000*l.*'

To this scheme we have several objections. More especially do

do we object to the reduction of the income of the see of London from 10,000*l.* to 6000*l.*, which involves an entire change in the social position of that prelate. Nor do we think 4500*l.* is too high an income for any bishop, and we deprecate such infinitesimal changes as those involved in varying the bishoprics of Carlisle, Chester, Lichfield, Norwich, Peterborough, Ripon, and St. David's, from incomes of 4500*l.* to incomes of 4200*l.* The gain is not worth the trouble. But still, without entering into further criticism of the Chancellor's scheme, it may be worth while to admit his principle, and to consider whether increased episcopal superintendence may not be secured to the Church without the sacrifice of episcopal state and dignity.

The present aggregate income of the English bishops is 152,200*l.*, from which (to be accurate) must be deducted 2850*l.* a year paid to Queen Anne's Bounty in the name of first fruits and tenths. The scale of income by which this sum is exhausted must be admitted to be high, when compared with all official salaries in the country; but, on the other hand, many of the sees have expensive houses attached to them, which involve a certain style of living. But the argument from houses has no real weight. If an archbishop would be poor with the income of a Lord Chancellor, or a bishop with the salary of a judge, because the ecclesiastical officer has to maintain a house and the legal officer can live where he likes, then the inference is abundantly clear and need not be stated. Nor is the scale quite equally adjusted; for example, it is difficult to understand why the see of Ely requires exactly 1000*l.* a year more than Carlisle, and 500*l.* more than the diocese that most resembles it —Oxford. Suppose 12,000*l.* a year to be deemed sufficient for the Archbishop of Canterbury, and 9000*l.* for his northern brother. London, Durham, and Winchester would fairly have 8000*l.*, 7000*l.*, and 6000*l.* respectively. In most of these five cases, perhaps in all, the question of house or houses would need re-consideration. Ely and Oxford would claim 5000*l.*, and perhaps Gloucester and Bristol, on account of the need of occasional residence in Bristol. In fourteen dioceses—Bath and Wells, Exeter, Lincoln, Rochester, Salisbury, Worcester, Manchester, Carlisle, Chester, Lichfield, Norwich, Peterborough, Ripon, and St. David's—4500*l.* would be required; whilst for the remaining five the present income of 4200*l.* might suffice. Tenths and first fruits should be abolished, for it is absurd to fix an income by one statute, and provide that it should be diminished by another. The reduction would be 11,200*l.* a year, or allowing for first fruits and tenths, 8350*l.*

This difference would be available for the founding of new sees.

sees. The proposal of Chancellor Burton to found *seven* new bishoprics seems to us quite unnecessary. Four, not being even named, we dismiss at once; and the reasons which in 1857 prevailed against the erection of Westminster into a bishopric exist at the present time, and are reinforced by other considerations. The three new sees for the erection of which Parliament may be said to have pronounced are St. Alban's, Southwell, and one in Cornwall. But their claims are by no means equally pressing. St. Alban's would give an opportunity of revising the boundaries of all the dioceses that touch London, and this is urgently needed. Southwell would relieve the enormous dioceses of Lichfield and Lincoln. The case of Cornwall stands by itself. The population of that county at the last census was 369,000, and of these it may be feared that a very large proportion have gone over to dissent. A bishop is needed there no doubt; but the difference between St. Alban's and Southwell on one side, and Cornwall on the other, is, that on the one part there is a large population of churchmen asking for pastoral care such as a bishop can give, whilst on the other the feeling of love for the Church and her offices must be created. The dioceses of Lincoln and Lichfield, to be relieved by Southwell, will contain a population of nearly two million souls; the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Winchester, which might be affected by St. Alban's, contain well nigh four millions and a half; whilst to Bodmin or Truro not more than 369,000 could be transferred, of whom too many would regard the transaction with much indifference, owning no fealty to any with authority, excepting to those of their own choosing. The provision of the means for founding the two bishoprics of St. Alban's and Southwell seems all that is necessary, and 9000*l.* a year would effect this object.

Chancellor Burton deals as vigorously with the cathedrals as with the episcopacy, reducing the six deaneries of Canterbury, York, St. Paul's, Westminster, and Durham, to incomes of 1500*l.* a year, and the other deaneries to a monotonous level of 1000*l.*; and the canonries in those six cathedrals and in Ely to three, and all other cathedrals to two, persons. On the other hand, he makes the incomes of all canonries 700*l.* or 750*l.* a year. By this means he obtains 38,000*l.* a year for the seven new sees and chapters, in addition to the 17,000*l.* obtained from the bishoprics, making a total of 55,000*l.*, which he divides at the rate of about 8000*l.* to each, giving 4200*l.* to the bishop and the rest to the chapter.

We deprecate altogether any reduction in the existing incomes of the deans and canons of the six principal cathedrals; the distance is already too great between the lowest bishop and the

the highest subordinate dignitary, and we would rather see Westminster and St. Paul's better endowed. Under the present system of residence incomes of 2000*l.* a year attached to the deaneries of Canterbury, York, St. Paul's, Westminster, and Windsor, with an additional thousand for the Dean of Durham on account of the wardenship of the University of Durham, appear to be capable of no diminution, while the existence of deans with incomes of barely 1000*l.* a year is one of the mistakes requiring to be corrected. It would be the worst policy to render the more prominent positions in the Church untenable save with considerable private fortune, and it is impossible to fulfil the duties of a dean, resident as he necessarily is in a cathedral city, in a dignified public position with an income of less than 1500*l.* a year. It is a mere mockery to transfer a learned man from a benefice to a deanery, perhaps as a reward for his learning and services in defence of the Church, and then leave him with 1000*l.* a year to exercise hospitality, and maintain a social position at least equal to that of the neighbouring clergy.

The reduction of the seven new bishoprics to two would correspondingly reduce the number of the new chapters, and 8000*l.* or 9000*l.* a year only would be required for their endowment. Much more than this would be found, without any material diminution of the dignity and usefulness of the cathedral corporations, by the extension of the term of residence and reduction in the numbers of the canonries.

Michelet remarks that the animal creation in Australia, with its duckbills, its wingless birds, and marsupials of unequal limbs, seems less complete and balanced than that of other quarters of the world. We may presume to say of human works what Michelet said mistakenly of divine. The Church reformers of Bishop Blomfield's generation left a part of their work incomplete; the present constitution of deans and chapters can neither be understood nor defended. Chapters are the *apteryx* of our system; they are the bird that cannot fly. The old theory of chapters was a beautiful one. That counsel which once the bishop had taken with all the clergy of the diocese, and later with all that lived in and around his cathedral town, he was to find with a certain chosen body of ecclesiastics attached to the cathedral church. Two qualifications would seem to be required for this duty: that the men should be chosen for it, and that they should be resident. The modern system provides, at a great cost—the revenues of the dean and four canons—as much attendance at the church as an active rector with 500*l.* a year provides for his parish church by the aid of a curate; that is to say, there are two members of the chapter

chapter present, though often only one. Four canons make up among them twelve months of residence: and where there is only one house of residence, two canons do not even meet: one departs, and after two days of an inevitable char-woman, the other takes his place. The bishop perhaps does not suffer for want of a council by this; in many cases he does not choose the members, nor are they chosen for this absolute function. But the harm and loss to the cathedral and to the city are very great. One who lives three-fourths of his time elsewhere, and only one-fourth in his canonical residence, is not likely to throw his heart into his capitular functions. From his college, or professorship, or country benefice, he betakes himself to his canonry for three months of rest. He cannot throw himself into the business and the interests of the place; his residence is but a holiday, it is too short for business, and also too sweet. The benefices of a cathedral town have always somehow dwindled into poverty, like the shrubs under the cold shadow of the forest tree. Minor canons hold them, and bestow on them whatever of time, and energy, and work, their cathedral duties leave them. To compensate for this the city enjoys in theory the constant presence and light of a picked body of clergymen, active, learned, well-endowed, able and willing to aid all good works. Practically, however, they are not there. With proper rules of residence, a dean and two canons would render more service in the cathedral, and far more in the city, than the present staff. As machinists make the 'footpound' the unit of mechanical forces, we will make the month's residence the unit of spiritual work; thus at present a dean residing eight months, and four canons residing three months each, give us twenty months of residence, whereas a dean and only two canons resident for nine months each would give twenty-seven. But the gain would be greater still, because the residence under that system would be home residence; whilst under the present it is too apt to be play-time. Some such change should take place with the chapters lest worse befall them.

We return to our summary of results. We have seen that pluralities are almost extinguished, and that the subdivisions of overgrown parishes, and the augmentation of poor livings, has been carried out so far, that the enormously large, but not altogether hopeless, additional amount of 300,000*l.* a year devoted to this object will do much to secure fair provision for the relief of spiritual destitution, and to provide a decent, though very moderate, minimum income for the clergy. The fact of the large number of advowsons of rural parishes belonging to the laity has also a point of view from which hope may be derived that a hearty

a hearty and generous recognition of the claims of the incumbents may, in the course of no very long period, place such livings upon a level with those in public patronage.

We have seen that residence is now the rule with parochial incumbents, and non-residence the rare exception, and we believe that all parties within the Church of England, and all candid observers from without, will agree that the clergy as a body have never at any previous time so earnestly discharged the duties entrusted to them. The very differences in opinion which create so much apparent strife and discord, are indications of a healthy energy, far more satisfactory than the deadly torpor which not so very long since characterised both the clergy and the laity on all Church subjects. There is no Church so well calculated to meet the requirements of a manly tone of mind; her whole system is a recognition of individual responsibility; no authoritative judgment is pronounced on any man's Christian character, but each is left to judge of his own spiritual condition; and we fear no contradiction when we say that no other form of worship is so acceptable to the non-religious portion of the population of our large towns. It requires only that sufficient provision should be made for church accommodation, and a very moderate degree of influence exercised in the right direction, to recover thousands who have been allowed to grow up in a total ignorance of all things Christian. We do not think that the church accommodation should be provided, even in the towns, by driving the higher and middle classes from their accustomed seats, and leaving the churches free to all comers; and still less is such a course desirable, or even possible, in the ten thousand rural parochial districts; in which, indeed, there are at all times seats practically free. We think that every parishioner is with his family entitled both by law and in justice to be seated by the churchwardens, and that the only remedy for the deficiency of church accommodation is an adequate provision of churches.

The system of church extension, to which the gifted Chalmers dedicated his best energies in Scotland, was that which the Church of England is endeavouring to carry out. It requires that the pulpit and the week-day pastoral duties of the incumbent shall apply to the same individuals living in one locality, and forming a population of so moderate an amount as to admit of being thoroughly cultivated both ministerially and pastorally. Chalmers, in his 'Right Ecclesiastical Economy of a Large Town,' discussing this question, sums up:—

'The whole gist of our argument lies in the difference it makes to the power and tactics of an ecclesiastical system on cities whether it shall be a mere system of congregations or a system of parishes, and

so

so of district, parochial, and territorial arrangements. Under the one system the people are left to seek out their own minister; and *so many* seek him out accordingly. Under the other system the minister is bound to seek out *all* the people within the limits of his allocated domain. The system of general congregations stops at a limit which leaves out the great majority. The parochial system of congregations can be made co-extensive with the wants of the whole population. We confess ourselves to be most intensely set on the restoration of the true parochial system in our cities, and that because it bears with such signal effect on the reformation of the common people, that highest object which can be proposed either to the Christian philanthropist or the patriot.'

The decision of the precise mode of worship to be adopted lies, within certain limits, with the laity, and, whatever that decision may be, we are quite unable to understand why there should be any misgiving as to the future of the Church of England, or why a desponding tone should be affected as to its prospects.

We apprehend that there never has been a period in its history when the result of the contest between its friends and its enemies has been so likely to depend upon the general conviction that it is capable of performing the duties entrusted to it by the State. Whatever may be their internal differences, the clergy are at least free from the charge of inertness, carelessness, and want of life. Even if zeal be a fault, it is seldom of long continuance, nor is it very severely judged when it exists, and if in more than one direction energy is developed in forms which a sober judgment may regret, it is certain to be brought by the influence of the laity into consistency with the general tone of public opinion.

We have seen what the parochial arrangements have been from the Reformation to the present century, and the improvements that have already been effected afford every encouragement for the future. The increase of the number of the clergy from about 11,000 in 1831 to 14,613 in 1841, and to 19,195 in 1861, exceeds in the proportion of eight to five the increase of the population in the same period. The number of clergy ordained in the decennial period to 1863, although a decrease compared with the ten years immediately preceding, is sufficient, the rate being 600 yearly, to raise and maintain a body of clergy very considerably exceeding the present number. The numerical decrease arose from the fact that the abolition of pluralities in 1838, and the founding of the Pastoral Aid and Additional Curates' Societies in 1837, occasioned a most rapid increase of clergy in the succeeding years, which necessarily subsided when the special demand fell back towards its natural level. Never

was

was there such a chance of promotion for curates as occurred after 1838 on the decease of the elder pluralists, holding two, or three, or four preferments; and young men never had better opportunities of rising in the Church than during the last thirty years, and especially during the middle portion of that period. We think that any curate of fifteen years' standing, if he has been and is in all respects eligible, has been most unfortunate.

The Church Congress at Wolverhampton is the last important assemblage of the representatives of the various forms of Church of England thought, and never before has there been in any such assemblage an equal amount of toleration and of candid consideration of the views of acknowledged opponents.

Without going so far as Dean Colet, every party seemed to feel that those who conscientiously differed from its particular views were aiming at the same object, though by a more or less different road; and for the first time at such a place the recovery of the Nonconformists became a principal subject of discussion. The Church of England owes an inextinguishable debt of gratitude to the Wesleyan and other dissenting communities which voluntarily provided spiritual instruction for the people when her own deficiencies, whether of means or of earnestness, left large masses of the population altogether uncared for; for the Nonconformists have recently provided spiritual instruction for one-half of the population in Cornwall and Wales, and for one-third in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. In the felicitous language of the Bishop of Oxford at the Working Men's Meeting:—

'The great religious differences which now divide and weaken us exist more upon the memory of past evils than upon present necessity; and if churchmen and dissenters would unite together to exalt the one name of Christ, and for the love of that name seek heartily and thoroughly for brotherly communion in one common Church, England might have it, and having it she might be first in the things spiritual, and then would, in things material, be more than a match for a divided world around her.'

Several important Societies have long been maintained by the conjoint support of members of different Protestant communions, and it is not in the least degree probable that the admitted differences between them will prevent the continuance of such harmonious concert. Even Charles V. of Spain in his retirement at St. Yuste, after battling Luther's heresy all his life, was fain to admit the absurdity of his having attempted to bring men into an uniformity of belief, when he could not make any two of his many time-pieces agree with each other. The freedom of opinion which frankly states objections to assertions of fact or of doctrine

doctrine is an inseparable part of that spirit of general investigation which operates upon every branch of study, and, just as the historical records of the past, disentombed within the present century, only confirm the accuracy of the sacred narrative, continued investigation may be expected to supply continued confirmation of its truth. But, whatever the result, knowledge must be increased, as certainly as men must run to and fro on the face of the earth, or ideas be instantaneously exchanged between its remotest countries.

If with Erasmus we believe that 'science can never truly conflict with Christianity,' we can well afford to pause until further knowledge enables us to reconcile apparently conflicting facts, and in the meantime endeavour to bring the material organisation of the Church into the condition calculated to effect the greatest amount of good. It is only necessary to persevere in the policy of the last thirty years, to ensure that our posterity will re-echo the words of Bishop Blomfield, written under much less favourable circumstances in 1816, and will feel 'that the glory of our Establishment and the secret of its usefulness is the division of the country into districts of manageable size, each with its church, its pastor, its schools, and local charities;' and when the story of the full extension of the parochial system can be told some years hence in all its completeness, it will be confessed that those very measures, for which he was in his lifetime so much blamed, have proved to be the saving of the Established Church.

ART. IX.—1. *Contributions to an Inquiry into the State of Ireland.* By the Right Hon. Lord Dufferin, M.P.
2. *The Irish in America.* By J. F. Macguire, M.P.
3. *A Few Words on the Relation of Landlord and Tenant.* By the Earl of Rosse.

SCHILLER compares the position of the Netherlands when the Duke of Alva had arrived with his army, and before he began to give effect to those deep-laid schemes which he and his royal master had carefully matured, to the state of a person who has swallowed a draught of deadly poison which has not yet begun to operate. It was the case of Socrates, who after drinking the hemlock walked about his cell until his legs grew heavy, and then lay down to rise up again no more. How unspeakably important must that brief and awful interval have seemed to his disciples! When

When it had passed, how many things must have occurred to them which they might have asked, but which now they would ask in vain! Something of the same kind has occurred, or rather is now occurring, to this country. We cannot indeed say, positively, that we have swallowed a dose of poison. The office of Prime Minister has never hitherto been regarded as identical with that of Public Executioner; nor do we recognise the Athenian Eleven in the very polite and accommodating gentlemen who fill the principal offices of State. Nevertheless it is quite certain that we have in the year 1867 done that which has as effectually taken out of our hands the control over our own destinies, as the arrival of the Spanish General did in the Netherlands; and that, whether the change be for good or for evil, a very large, sweeping, and important change it is sure to be.

The interval of time which must elapse between the passing of the Reform Bill and the general election is important both for the purposes of action and speculation. That it will be used for any vigorous or useful action we do not venture to hope. The occasion calls trumpet-tongued on our dying Legislature to rise and bestir itself. There are several questions which it would be wise and prudent to settle now, and not leave to perplex the deliberations and excite the passions of the new Parliament. The persons principally interested in the speedy and peaceful settlement of such questions seem quite unaware of the golden opportunity which they are allowing to slip from them, and which can never, under any possible conjuncture of circumstances, return. If we turn to the House itself, there is little or no ground for hoping that it will employ the last session to be held under the ancient constitution of England in placing some few subjects, at least, clear of the whirlpool of democratic innovation. No one could fail to observe, during the last short session, a lassitude, a relaxation of fibre, an indisposition to grapple seriously with anything, and a want of confidence in themselves, which leave little ground for hoping that our legislators will turn their minds vigorously to any problem beyond the immediate routine of their necessary duties. Whatever energy the Legislature brought with it from the hustings, it has expended in the work of self-destruction; this it has thoroughly accomplished. It knows that it is dead; and, if asked to give any proof of vitality, would probably answer by the question, 'O son of man! can these bones live?' Every man's mind is engrossed in the attempt to solve the momentous question of his own future fate at the coming election; and in this absorbing consideration the affairs of the country

country are, for the time at least, utterly lost and overlooked. Then there is the Government; but the Government has established its character as a waiter upon the pleasure of the House, and has very clearly proved that it has no substantive policy to propose. Whatever else we have gained by the legislation of 1867 we seem, at any rate, to have lost a Government, and we know not how long it may be before we find one.

In this paralysis of the powers of the State we cannot, we believe, spend our time to better account than in examining with all possible calmness and impartiality questions which are sure to be dealt with somehow or other, whenever the present exhaustion shall give place, as it is sure sooner or later to do, to a period of violent unreasoning and inconsiderate activity. Now common sense may perhaps obtain a hearing; then it will be altogether too late. There is cast upon Parliament by recent changes a very heavy duty, such a duty as has never before devolved on any Parliament, the duty of bringing our institutions and our policy into harmony with the new state of things which have so suddenly been called into existence. To read the speeches of Ministers and their supporters, one would suppose that the era of change was closed, and that nothing remained for us but to go on exactly as we did before political power had entirely and finally changed hands. We thus seem condemned to two of the greatest evils conceivable for an old and settled country: to a great needless and violent change in the very foundation of our institutions, and to a policy which utterly ignores the change it has wrought, and assumes that the vehicle of State can go on just as heretofore, because we have only deepened the ruts but not diverted the track in which we are to move. It will not be the fault of those who take such a view of public affairs, if we do not find ourselves involved in all the evils of two opposing systems: of a turbulent democracy, irritated to new violence by a studied inaction, and of a sham conservatism mining still more deeply the institutions it has already shaken to their base by a futile effort to preserve them unaltered in the approaching period of universal change.

Among the questions thus urgently pressed upon our notice by the iron and inexorable logic of events none are more important, none more difficult, none more irritating than those connected with Ireland. Ireland has in its case this peculiar difficulty. No one can represent its present condition as satisfactory. No one can consider its treatment up to Catholic Emancipation as just. No one can pretend not to be aware of the demands that are put forward on its behalf. And yet those who have thought deeply and carefully on this most interesting

and difficult subject are well aware that none of these popular and obvious remedies will lead to a satisfactory solution. Ireland is unhappy. Ireland is poor. Ireland is, to some extent at least, disaffected. Ireland has undergone many wrongs. Ireland is never weary of suggesting remedies. What so simple as to act at once—to pass an Act of Parliament, giving her all she asks, as one of the speakers at a Reform meeting said, and make her at once happy and contented? There is great risk that in the absence of all direction and initiative from Government, clamour and impulse will prevail, and something will be done which so far from mending matters will make them far worse than at present. Nothing would be easier than to pass a measure of claptrap liberality to Ireland, which must deepen her poverty, disorganise her society, make the division between classes, religions, and races yet wider and deeper than at present, and prepare the way for endless calamities, the *contre-coup* of which would speedily make itself felt on the shores of Great Britain.

Before, then, we come to the question of remedies for Irish evils, we request our readers to take patience and calmly and dispassionately to examine with us the principles upon which any Government that is true to the whole empire, and can raise itself above a narrow and partisan spirit, must inevitably deal with Ireland. Before we consider what we may do, let us first clearly understand what we may not. Let us bring our problem within the narrowest compass that we can. When this has been done we can proceed on more trodden ground to investigate the existing evils of Ireland and their causes; and lastly, to consider how far the popular nostrums meet such evils, and whether anything more efficient can be suggested. The investigation may be troublesome; but surely if there is any subject worth the trouble of a minute and painful investigation it is Ireland. Ireland is the problem of problems to the English statesmen. In its future, the future of our empire, of our race, of our civilisation is wrapped up. It is to be feared that we do not sufficiently estimate the enormous interval between our relations to Ireland and those towards the dearest and most favoured dependency of the British Crown. Much as we may talk of our colonies, they are, after all, justly called by our law the foreign dominions of her Majesty. They are subject, indeed, to the control of Parliament, but that control is rapidly becoming merely nominal. If the matter is closely examined, the benefits we derive from them are far less than the benefits they receive from us. They enjoy an almost total immunity from the duty and burden of self-defence. Navy they have none; regular land-forces they have never attempted;

tempted; their militia mostly exists upon paper; their volunteers are more in will than deed. We must protect them, and for that protection we must not hope to receive in return a single man or a single shilling. If we once taxed them, they now heavily tax us. The United Kingdom is the Cinderella who does all the work of the imperial household. The fairy tale is reversed, and the younger sisters have enslaved the elder. We have learnt to consider the severance of such a tie as this as something not greatly to be deprecated; nay, in the case of our North American and West Indian colonies, as devoutly to be wished.

It is to be feared that the practice, which has obtained of late years of gradually relaxing our hold on our colonies, and of contemplating the proximate severance of some of them from the empire without regret, and the independence of them all at no remote period of time as an inevitable necessity, has tended in some degree to confuse the ideas of men as to our relation to Ireland. It cannot be too earnestly impressed upon the mind of England that Ireland is not a colony; never can be treated as a colony; never can be, for weal or for woe, anything else than an integral and vital part of the British empire, whose union and amalgamation with Great Britain, so far from being, like the union or independence of a colony, a matter of small account, is a matter which we cannot permit for a single moment to be called in question. This difference between Ireland and all the rest of the empire depends upon its proximity to us. If Cato could work upon the fears and passions of the Roman Senate by exhibiting to them the figs which he had gathered with his own hand at Carthage, only three days' sail from the Tiber, what should be the feelings of an English Parliament when the distance is measured by three hours instead of three days? Were Ireland a country capable of maintaining itself in independence, the case might be likened to that of the dominions of the Plantagenets in France; but we know only too well from the violent factions which divide the country, from its poverty, and the large portion of it that lies, and probably always must lie, useless, that its strength is in no proportion to its size; and that if it ceased to be the partner on perfectly equal terms of the empire of Great Britain, Ireland would infallibly fall into the hands of some Power who would use it as a post from which to direct attacks upon our coasts and our commerce.

Another weighty consideration is that England, though powerful by her wealth and by the machinery which multiplies to an almost infinite extent the productive power of a limited population, is poor in land—that is, in land which she can treat

as an integral part of her dominions: land from which she can draw men to protect her in war and enrich her in peace, and money to meet the expenses of the vast and complicated administration with which she has burdened herself. Continental dominions she has held and lost, and would undoubtedly lose again if she possessed them. An island so near to her shores she has held for 700 years through all vicissitudes of chequered fortune, and that long period not only gives her a prescriptive title which supersedes all inquiry into the original mode of acquisition, but also proves that she has the power, so long as she has the will, to retain this ancient and indispensable part of the kingdom. Hard necessity may make nations consent to anything; but England would feel the loss of Ireland just as keenly as the loss of Wales or Northumberland, and would be bound to struggle just as energetically to prevent it. That descent from the position of a first-rate to that of a second-rate Power, which foreigners are perpetually predicting for us whenever we disembarrass ourselves of any portion of our overgrown dominions, would assuredly fall upon us from the day that we parted with Ireland. No sacrifice would be too great to retain this necessary part of the kingdom, no danger too terrible to encounter rather than submit to the loss of the third part of our power, which no other acquisition could possibly compensate or replace.

We therefore feel justified in laying down as a first principle with regard to Ireland that we cannot entertain for a moment the idea of a separation, and that whatever policy we adopt towards her, it must on no account tend in the slightest degree towards such a calamity. The latter words of this proposition are perhaps the most important part of it. Few people, except the avowed enemies of the British name and empire, will be found to advise its disruption by the separation of Ireland. Indeed, the tendency of opinion is, in general, in exactly the contrary direction. There are many persons in England, and many more in France, who, confounding the extent with the power of an empire, would regard the conquest and occupation of Abyssinia as a real and solid increase of British power, and consider that to part with Jamaica, for instance, would be a serious blow to our resources and prestige. But though there is no reason to apprehend a direct proposal for severing Ireland from England, there are several propositions which find favour with persons by no means hostile to this country which would really amount to the same thing. Foremost among these is O'Connell's proposition for the repeal of the Union. In a letter to the 'Daily News,' to which we shall have occasion to refer again in the course

course of this article, Mr. Goldwin Smith reviews the ordinary prescriptions for the disorder of Ireland, and, having found them all worthless, sums up the case in the following way:—

'The Irish Union has missed its port, and in order to reach it will have to tack again. . . . . If these remarks are true, they would seem to point to some decided measure of provisional decentralisation which shall make Dublin really the capital of Ireland, and render it possible for an Irishman to be a patriot without being a rebel. To do this without dissolving the Union or shutting out the hope of a perfect incorporation in the end, would obviously be a hard task for our statesmanship; to do it at all would be a hard trial for our pride. But how else are we to make patriotism possible in Ireland, which is the one essential thing to be done. In the spirit of this policy I should say, in answer to the perplexing question, what is to be done with the property of the Irish establishment? that which seems good to its rightful owners the Irish people.'

Now Mr. Goldwin Smith disclaims in this passage the wish to dissolve the Union, and we have no doubt of his sincerity; but, though his language is guarded, and, perhaps intentionally obscure, we can scarcely avoid seeing in it a strong tendency in the very direction he deprecates. The regenerating power on which he relies is Irish patriotism, and an Irish patriot is of necessity, he tells us, a rebel. The way to closer and better union, then, lies in giving a legitimate expansion to the present rebellious feelings, by making Dublin really the capital of Ireland, and by giving to the Irish, without the interference of the English, the right to appropriate the revenues of the Established Church. We are to encourage and defer to the spirit of disunion, in order to create out of it by some mystic and undefined process ultimately a closer union. We are to treat Ireland homœopathically; because she is at present too much inclined to separate, we are to go along with her wish, and trust to cure her by indulging it. We, on the other hand, confess ourselves no disciples of the new philosophy, which professes to believe that rights and constitutions are better protected by a base surrender than by a spirited defence, and as we are opposed to the separation of Ireland and England, we are also opposed to all counsels which tend in that direction. Sydney Smith shall speak for us:—

'Civil war is preferable to repeal. Much as I hate wounds, dangers, privations, and explosions—much as I love regular hours of dinner—foolish as I think men covered with the feathers of the male *Pullus domesticus*, and covered with lace in the course of the ischiatic nerve—much as I detest all these follies and ferocities—I would rather turn soldier myself than acquiesce quietly in such a separation of the empire. It

'It is such a piece of nonsense that no man can have any reverence for himself who would stop to discuss such a question. It is such a piece of anti-British villany, that none but the bitterest enemy of our blood and people could entertain such a project. It is to be met only with round and grape, to be answered by Shrapnel and Congreve; to be discussed in hollow squares, and refuted by battalions four deep; to be put down by the ultima ratio of that armed Aristotle, the Duke of Wellington.'

An Irish Parliament in College Green must inevitably make shipwreck on one of two dangers. If confined within safe limits, that is to matters purely local, it would be worthless for the purposes of government, and only useful for the ends of agitation and treason. If it had full powers, the separation of the two islands would be its inevitable result. The first effect of a Repeal of the Union would be to withdraw from Ireland the very substantial power she possesses over the administration of public affairs, and to offer instead an illusory power of disposing of her own. We say an illusory power, for though in Parliament all Irish questions are treated as if they were merely questions between England and Ireland, in Ireland everybody knows that these questions are really nothing of the kind, but subjects of daily and bitter contention between Irishmen themselves. Instead of being the antagonist or oppressor of Ireland, the mission of England mainly consists in preventing Irishmen from fighting out in pitched battles, and with deadly weapons, the questions which it is proposed as a panacea for Irish evils to leave to the decision of the Irish people. As regards the Irish Church for instance, a large majority of the representatives of Ireland are in favour of retaining it, and yet its destruction is constantly put forward as the means of appeasing Irish discontent. The establishment of a Parliament in College Green would be the signal for civil war which could only be stayed by the interference of England, who is asked to withdraw in the name of peace.

For the same reasons as those which lead us to regard any tampering with the legislative union as a move in the direction of ultimate separation, we earnestly dissent from a notion which has found favour in some quarters, that though the Union ought to be preserved, it is the duty of Parliament to leave Irish questions to be decided by Irish members among themselves, just as Scotch members decide on questions relating to Scotland. Now we are disposed to think, in the first place, that this proceeding of the Scotch members is a precedent by no means worthy of imitation. Scotland has indeed by adroit management secured to herself the management of her own affairs,

affairs, but in so doing it is to be apprehended that she has cut herself off from the advantage which she might have derived from the experience and ability of some 600 members of the House of Commons. She has kept the Legislature, and consequently the press and public opinion generally, in ignorance of her laws and institutions; so that closely united as she is to us in feeling, in policy, and interest, she presents to every Englishman who penetrates the least below the surface of things the aspect of a foreign country. It is quite possible to be too local and too national, and had Scotland been less careful to keep her affairs apart from the ken of her sister kingdoms, we cannot help thinking that she would have caught more of that wisdom which is to be found in a multitude of disinterested counsellors.

Be this as it may, the means by which Scotland has obtained this questionable success are wanting to Ireland. Scotland is left to manage her own affairs because her representatives know how to wash their dirty linen at home, and to submit the opinion of the minority to that of the majority. Has Ireland any pretension to these virtues? On what point can Protestant and Catholic meet, and be content to accept the decision of the majority as binding upon the minority? Such a caucus would be a scene of hopeless and helpless discord. Besides, if we are to decide Irish affairs purely by Irish opinion, even if we should admit that Irish opinion gives on any important subject a clear and certain sound, how shall we escape the argument that as we are content to carry on affairs as if a Parliament were sitting in College Green, and as the sitting of such a Parliament would give satisfaction to Ireland, we had better do the thing handsomely at once and separate the two Legislatures? Nay, it might with much plausibility be argued, that such a change would even be an improvement, since Ireland would then have only her own affairs to arrange, and would be relieved from all concern in Imperial questions.

Another conclusion to be drawn from the fundamental principle which we have laid down for our guidance — that Ireland must be preserved at whatever cost as an integral part of the Empire—is, that we must not allow our natural and laudable desire to conciliate opposition and to quiet discontent to induce us to alienate or to betray the garrison to whom in the last resort we must look for the maintenance of the connexion of Ireland with Great Britain. On a subject so little capable of proof either way it is impossible to speak with absolute confidence, but we run little risk of contradiction when we say that it is on the Saxon and Protestant, rather than on the Celtic and Catholic elements of Irish population, that the hope of a peaceful and

willing

willing adherence to the union between the two islands rests. We have other means in our hands by which we can enforce it; but we are bound if possible to avoid an appeal to harsh and ungracious measures of coercion. So long as any considerable body of Irishmen seize greedily on every opportunity of parading their undying and irreconcilable hostility to the English connexion; so long as we are to be opposed and thwarted—not because we are wrong, not because we are tyrannical, not because we are unjust, but because we are Englishmen—we must, on the simplest and plainest principles of self-defence, endeavour to satisfy and retain on our side that portion of the community that is friendly to the British connexion, and not in the pursuit of claptrap liberality eternally to alienate our friends without in the slightest degree conciliating our enemies. When Ireland enjoyed the blessing of a domestic Legislature, the Protestants put a price on their support of the English connexion such as no party ought to have asked, and no just nation ought to have conceded. In return for their services in preserving Ireland to us they claimed absolute political and social supremacy, a reign of privilege for the one faith, of proscription and degradation for the other. Those days are gone never to return. The danger now is just the contrary: not that we should trample on the Catholic, but that we should alienate the Protestant.

We have now completed our enumeration of the principles which in our opinion ought to guide us in deciding any Irish question. They ought never to be lost sight of. The problem which Ireland presents is not one of abstract justice but of political expediency, not what may be claimed as a right by those who deny us any right at all, but what is necessary if we would maintain the integrity of the British Empire, and its present position among the Powers of the world. The fundamental principle is that under no conceivable circumstances would England be justified in entertaining for a single moment the idea of such a dismemberment of the Empire as would be involved in the political separation of Ireland from Great Britain. This must underlie all our deliberations, and its violation, or a tendency to violate it, should be deemed by every good subject utterly fatal to any proposal for the satisfaction of Irish discontent. As tending towards such a separation we reject the idea of a repeal of the legislative union; and as almost equivalent to the repeal of the Legislature we reject the idea of governing Ireland by Irish opinion, and limiting the functions of English members of Parliament to affirming and recording whatever Irish members may agree upon, if indeed they can be induced to agree

agree upon anything. Lastly, we consider that all demands that may be made for change must be viewed with reference to the feelings and wishes of those who hold Ireland fast to the British connexion, and that expedient as it is to conciliate our opponents, it is still more expedient not to alienate and disgust our friends. Subject to these qualifications, which are forced upon us by the necessity of our political situation, and which are too often overlooked, we hold that the case of Ireland ought to be regarded without affection or prejudice and with the most sincere desire to do justice to all parties; and that, under the pressure of recent changes in our own government, we should beware of immolating the destinies of a nation to a vain clinging to consistency where consistency is no longer wise, or even, the novelty of the situation being taken into account, really consistent.

We now proceed to examine Irish discontent, as it manifests itself under the different forms of Fenianism, land agitation, emigration, and agitation against the Established Church. And first of Fenianism, as at once the most logical, the most pressing, and the most prominent form of Irish discontent. Fenianism has its negative as well as its positive side, and in order to know what it is we must first clearly understand what it is not. Fenianism is not directed to the reform of grievances, it is not an agitation which is to cease upon certain concessions being made. Let us hear a very able exponent of it, who has been suffered to develope his notions at full length and with the utmost explicitness and openness in the pages of a monthly magazine:—

'The first radical error,' says this charmingly candid writer, 'in regard to Ireland, is to believe that the Irish people will be contented with anything less than complete independence of England. Good English laws, good English government, good English reforms for Ireland, are all very well in their way; but they do not touch the Irish question any more than good Austrian government, good Austrian reforms, touched the Italian question. Is it so very difficult for you to understand that the Irish people want to be rid of England altogether—that they would rather have bad laws of their own making than good ones of yours—that they would rather be badly governed by themselves than well governed by you—and that no possible reforms, even though they were Utopian in their blessings, would be acceptable to the Irish people so long as they had that hated word English affixed to them? Why, for the last half hundred years you have been improving your treatment of Ireland, and it is undeniable that many of the worst evils which formerly afflicted her unhappy people have been removed. Hundreds of thousands of people have emigrated from Ireland; the population, thus thinned out, is better provided for than ever before; the island is on the whole much more prosperous; but

still

still the hatred to England is as deep, the disposition to conspiracies as prevalent, the desire for independence as heartfelt, as in the bad old days. . . . The royal visits to Ireland, which were once considered as the sovereign panacea for Irish disloyalty—the land distribution, advocated by John Bright and others—the abolition of the Irish Church Establishment, now mooted as a sure cure for Fenianism—are toys given to hungry men. What the Fenians desire is Ireland for the Irish, and they look upon all the promised reforms as bribes to seduce true patriots from a righteous purpose.'

Surely this is plain speaking, and if we do not understand the subject thoroughly it is our own fault. Mr. Macguire, in his recent book, 'The Irish in America,' strongly, though unintentionally, confirms this view. He does indeed exhort us to change our policy towards Ireland, but he gives us the very best reason to believe that such a change will do us no good at all. His facts contradict his conclusion. The part of the book, to which just now we naturally look with the greatest interest, is the last chapter, which treats of the feeling of the Irish in America towards England. But, when we pass from the existence of the feeling to its causes, we receive very little encouragement to hope anything from a change of measures. What we do we must do because it is right, and without hope of any other reward than the approbation of a good conscience. The animosity of these people cannot be removed by reason, because it is not caused by reason. Here are the only causes of hostility we can find in Mr. Macguire's book:—

'A quarter of a century before, the man had been evicted under circumstances of singular and painful severity' (probably by another Irishman); 'in his heart he cherished a feeling of hatred and vengeance, not so much against the individual by whom the wrong was perpetrated as against the Government by whose authority it was inflicted.'—p. 603.

These are the words of another evicted tenant:—

'"Well, father, I went down on my knees, and, the Lord pardon me! I swore I'd never forgive that night and day and the men that done that wrong, and I never will; and I'll never forgive *the bloody English Government* that allowed a man to be treated worse than I'd treat a dog, let alone a Christian, and sent their peelers and their army to help them to do it to me and others."'—p. 606.

Another Irish American—

'desired to learn, for an oration, what were the special restrictions which the jealousy of England still imposed on the industry and trade of Ireland? He knew little—indeed, he did not desire to know it—*of the* actual state of things; and when I assured him that, so far as th

the law stood, the merchants, manufacturers, and business men of Ireland were on a complete equality with their brethren in England, he could scarcely bring himself to believe what I said. He was literally disgusted.'—p. 611.

If ever there was a wicked and unprovoked attack on unoffending people it was the Fenian raid on Canada; but Mr. Macguire is at much pains to prove, and does prove by individual instances, that it was joined by persons of steady conduct, considerable property, and (otherwise) good character. Now, what avails reason or reform with people like these, who cannot even distinguish between governments and individuals, or between one country and another. If there is to be any law at all, people who detain the property of others after their right has expired must be removed; and if hardship ensues in the removal, the fault is first in the overholding tenant, next in the harsh landlord, but not in the State that makes the law and provides, as it is bound to do, against a breach of the peace in its execution. But if England has offended, surely Canada has not. Ireland asks for justice; and the Irish-American view of justice is to punish Canada, which is not represented in Parliament, for laws to which Ireland, which is fully represented there, is a party. We do not treat Ireland as a dependency, we do not exercise domination over her. We give the Irish an influence over the government of Great Britain, reference being had to the size, population, and wealth of the two countries, fully equivalent to that which we exercise over her. No Irishman labours, as such, under any disability. Dives has taken Lazarus into partnership, but Lazarus will have none of it; he demands under threat of the direst vengeance to be left in the solitary possession of his rags and his dunghill; he wants no improvement; his sole desire is separation. It is all an affair of sympathies, antipathies, and genealogies. Good is not good if it is English good, evil is not evil if it is Irish evil.

The wonderful nature of this political creed is only equalled by the strange means by which Fenianism seeks to give effect to it. Fenianism, whose pleasure it is to call herself Ireland, is at war she tells us with England, but she does not extend to us belligerent rights, nor does she take on herself belligerent duties. The idea is that she is to live among us, enjoying the protection of our laws, and, whenever it seems good to her, assassinate any one whose presence may be inconvenient to her. She denies that living under the protection of our institutions throws upon her any corresponding duty. If the Fenians kill us, it is done in war and justifiably; if we kill them, though after the most patient trial, it is murder of the blackest dye. War, as practised

by

by the Fenians, is in this respect inferior to ordinary hostilities that there is in it not even a pretence of considering for a moment the dictates of humanity.* No sacrifice of human misery is too great for any result, however small. Thus in order to give a bare possibility of escape to two prisoners in the Clerkenwell House of Detention, with a far greater chance that the prisoners might themselves be killed by the means used for rescuing them, Fenians did not hesitate to employ an agency which necessarily implied the death, torture, and mutilation of a large number of inoffensive people, whose only offence was that they lived near the prison that it was wished to break open. Persons used to ordinary crimes and criminals stand appalled at the selfish recklessness of men who, even while their co-conspirators were striving to get up sham funeral processions all over the country to impress upon us the sacredness of human life, take this strange and fearful way of showing how cheap and worthless it is in their eyes.

Fenianism has a permanent and a temporary cause, the first common to it with many other movements, the latter peculiar to itself. Its foundation lies deep in Irish character, in the disposition that prevails so strongly in the mind of the Irish race to live in the past instead of in the present, to seek instruction and inspiration from barbarous rather than civilised times, to exaggerate ancient and obsolete grievances, to avert its eyes from present and palpable benefits, to throw the whole blame of failure on Government, and to carry with them wherever they go the narrow prejudices and local passions of their own island. The temporary element of Fenianism is the effect, which will not be expended for some years, of the great American Civil War. It was the glory of Cromwell's army, as Macaulay tells us, that when they were disbanded they were absorbed at once into peaceful society, and proved themselves as good citizens as they had been soldiers. Such has not been the case, at least, with the Irish element of the American armies. They have acquired habits which fit them ill for peace. Idle, reckless, and dissipated, they prefer to prey on the delusions of their countrymen to winning their bread by honest industry; and we cannot reasonably expect a complete relief from this pest until these wild and desperate adventurers have become

* This is well put in Bishop Moriarty's circular to the clergy of his diocese:—'We are told that political offences should not be punished with death. If this doctrine is to be accepted, all political offenders should benefit equally by the immunity it affords. The British Government, which is deemed the oldest political offender in this country, may fairly demand that its servants shall not be put to death by their assailants. It is too much to expect that there should be such a one-sided bargain as would give the power of life and death only to the subject and take it from the ruler.'

either

either sobered by time, or thinned by the risks of their dreadful and hopeless trade.

If this be, as we believe it to be, a fair account of the objects, the means, and the causes of Fenianism, it only remains to consider how the evil must be met. When the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland was moved, Mr. Bright considered it a fitting opportunity to enlarge on the wrongs of Ireland, and to suggest that the true remedy for Fenianism was to be found in alterations of the tenure of land, and in the abolition of the Irish Church. He could not be brought to believe that the Fenians really meant to attack Chester Castle, but attributed the presence of strangers to a prize fight. The extract we have quoted above shows that we may at least free the question of Fenianism from all this rubbish. Whatever be the merits of Land Reform or Church destruction, they have nothing to do with Fenianism. It will run its course whether land be placed in new hands or left in old ones, whether cardinal or archbishop rule in Dublin. It is a national, not a religious nor an agrarian movement, its hatred is not so much of English institutions as of England itself. Ridiculous as it may sound, England with her fleets and armies, her vast empire, her boundless wealth, is championed to the utterance by a band of nameless and homeless adventurers, whose whole strength lies in their obscurity, their ignorance, and their recklessness. We cannot conciliate men who admit that they have no grievance and seek for no reform; we cannot persuade them, for they soar in regions where reason never reaches; leniency only makes them think that we are afraid of them; patience only further inflates their presumption. What then remains to us? Nothing but to accept the contest on the terms on which it is offered. They will not be bound by the law under which they choose to live. It is our duty to make that law respected and obeyed. We are strong enough to be just, and even magnanimous. We do not require any extraordinary remedies, unless indeed it may be thought that by suspending the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland we have made England a sort of asylum for desperate men, but what we do want is that the law in all its branches should be steadily and sternly enforced. Why is a portion of the Irish press permitted to poison the minds of the young and the ignorant, by a series of treasonable and seditious libels which would not be tolerated in any other country in the world? Why are respectably conducted magazines and newspapers suffered to make themselves the vehicle of publications written with no other purpose than that of disseminating sedition and treason? Why does the Home Secretary suffer himself to be mobbed in his own office?

office? Why is mercy extended to criminals who, having been released on their promise not to return, come back and repay our compassion by fresh treason? We must not hope that this quarrel will be fought out in a fair field. We must expect to have to deal with a series of dastardly offences such as we have had already. Our forces consist in the policeman, the judge, and the jury. But when we have obtained in a fair and open manner a conviction of a capital crime, we think we have a right to demand in the name of law and order that the extreme sentence shall be carried into effect. Is it not true mercy to deter by a wholesome severity men who think nothing of immolating a human hecatomb, for the mere chance of releasing a prisoner? Let us hear no more of political offences. Penal law has to do with people's intents, not with their motives. The refined considerations, which have been introduced in quieter times to moderate the severity of justice, are out of place when we are dealing with miscreants who seek by the violation of our municipal law to destroy the unity of the empire. We must defend ourselves where we are attacked. If by open war in the field, by the hand of the soldier; if by secret and concerted crimes, by the hand of the executioner. If we have real confidence in ourselves and in our institutions, let us not scruple to claim for them the same respect, and to support them by exacting the same penalties, as every Fenian thinks himself entitled to exact from the guardians of public peace and order, or to inflict on perfectly harmless and innocent persons, who have the misfortune to be near to the place where some grand pyrotechnic device in the cause of Irish independence is to be played off. The case then of Fenianism is very simple. It is a duel to be fought out between law and lawlessness, between order and violence, between treachery and barbarism on the one side, and all the elements of civilisation and progress on the other. In such a conflict we can only wish for success to the right, and look forward with confidence to the result.

But it does not follow that though any attempt to improve the condition of Ireland must be perfectly fruitless, as far as the checking of Fenianism is concerned, that we are therefore to put aside all idea of doing what may be done for the benefit of Ireland. The Fenians are pleased to declare war against us in the name of Ireland, but they have not yet shown their commission. The active element of Fenianism counts, we believe, very few supporters in Ireland, though the same toleration and sympathy for crime, which has formed so marked and painful a characteristic of Irish predial outrages, is not wanting to Fenianism. We believe that this foul and bloody conspiracy, which thinly

thinly masks the features of socialism and the lust of general plunder under the disguise of a desire for purely national government and institutions, is looked on with a kind of languid favour by thousands who have given it no open or avowed support. It would be an enterprise worthy of the highest statesmanship—a feat which all after ages would regard with undying gratitude—if any means could be hit upon by which this discontent could be once for all allayed, and Ireland raised to a position in which she would be at once willing and worthy, instead of wasting her energies and aspirations on silly dreams and idle retrospects, to take her position by our side as the sharer to the fullest extent in the noblest empire, in the most unbounded wealth, in the most ample opportunities for personal and national distinction that were ever offered to any people. These things the Irish have not created for themselves; the labour, the thrift, the energy of successive generations of Englishmen and Scotchmen have made them; and an unprecedented good fortune, if Ireland could only see it, has made it our interest, our duty, our wish, that she should enter into and enjoy them perfectly on a level with ourselves. At the same time, we must guard ourselves from the not unnatural error, that because Ireland earnestly desires something, it is necessary she should have it. We must look below the surface. We must see whether what she wants is really for her good, and we must be very careful that in the attempt to eradicate one disease we do not plant a worse. We are too fond of pulling up our flowers to see if they have taken root. We ought not to approach the matter from the side of old complaints for wrongs that have long been redressed, and injustices that have been amply atoned. Our concern is with the living present, with what is, not what has been; not how to undo the past, but how to improve the future.

The most prominent complaints that are put forth on behalf of Ireland have, as we have said, relation to three subjects—Land, Emigration, and the Church. We have in Ireland two distinct kinds of land tenure: the one regulated by law, the creature of contract, exactly similar to the tenure of England; the other regulated by secret societies, and enforced by the bludgeon and the blunderbus. The latter is of course entirely out of the reach of legislation, it rests on violation of the law, and the law has no further connexion with it than to punish its outrages whenever it can detect them. But it must be never lost sight of, when we are trying to understand the true nature of claims and complaints, in which one thing is put forward and another meant. Thus, the Tenant Right of Ulster is described under a most

a most specious form, as the right of one tenant to receive compensation from his successor for unexhausted improvements; but it really includes much more than this, it is a kind of tribute or black mail paid by the incoming tenant to his predecessor, in order to purchase a quiet enjoyment of his holding, in order, in fact, that he may not be shot from behind a hedge as he returns from market, or find a grave amid the burning rafters of his own farm-house. So the claim for compensation for unexhausted improvements is nominally put forward on the most equitable grounds to enable the tenant to receive the value of what he spends on his landlord's estate: but really it is felt and intended as a step to fixity of tenure, to the right to deal with the land in his occupation substantially as his own; to sell, to bequeath, to subdivide it, subject, for the present at least, to a quit-rent paid to the landlord. The time would soon come when the quit-rent would be declared an intolerable burden, and thus, by a peaceful and gradual revolution the land would be wrested from its present owners, and return to the Celtic race again. The Irish farmer aspires to the condition of the Indian ryot, who cultivates the land, paying rent to a zemindar, reserving the question how to deal with the zemindar for after consideration. Mr. Bright seems to have perceived that this ownership of the land they cultivate is the real object of Irish land agitation, when he proposes that the State should buy up some of the largest estates in Ireland, by giving more for them than they are worth, and retailing them to small proprietors. Mr. Mill also seems to have held the same opinion, since he based his support of a bill for giving compulsory compensation for improvements on the opinion that Ireland, and England too for that matter, were exceptions to the ordinary practice of the world with regard to land, and that the ownership should be taken from the landlord and given to the cultivator. Thus the proposal of compensation for improvements usually put forward as the remedy for Irish land grievances must be looked at from two points of view: first on its own merits, and next as it tends to obtain that fixity of tenure which is really sought, though sedulously kept in the background.

As a general principle nothing is more clear than that people should be left to make their own contracts their own way, that the State has no peculiar knowledge to guide it in the management of the private affairs of its citizens, and that they have an interest to do the best they can for themselves, which is quite wanting to any third non-contracting party. The State, as such, knows nothing of agriculture. The questions so much agitated by Mr. Mill, as to whether small cultivation is better than large, are not political; no, nor, with all deference to him be it said, are they politico-economical:

economical: they belong to the science of practical agriculture, and to the practical agriculturist we should leave them to work out for himself. The interest of the landlord and tenant, looked on from a general point of view, is identical; that interest is, that the land should be so cultivated as to yield the greatest profit. The interest of the country is the same, and so it would seem that the question might well be left in the hands of those more immediately concerned in its solution, since in this case public and private interest coincide. If it is the interest of the public that a thing should be done, make it the interest of individuals to do it. If it be their interest already, let them alone. But it is said, this might be so if landlord and tenant contracted on equal terms; but there is such a demand for land in Ireland, that the landlord can practically impose what terms he pleases. This seems to show that the remedy does not consist in forcing on the landlord terms which he is unwilling to agree to, but in reducing the demand for land; and this, as the quantity of land cannot be increased, can only be done by providing the competitors with more remunerative employment than its cultivation under existing conditions affords.

One means of effecting this is emigration, so loudly complained of as one of the principal evils of Ireland; another would be the establishment of manufactures, the investment of capital in mines, fisheries, and other occupations not agricultural. To the first of these palliatives Ireland strenuously objects, the second she does all in her power to discourage. Manufactures she once had, but the national genius for conspiracy and combination has driven them from her towns with the exception of Belfast, which remains a signal monument of what she might be and is not. For the investment of capital generally, she presents an admirable field, if her patriots, her orators, and her people were not as assiduously at work to frighten it away, like the boys that shout to frighten the birds from the new-sown corn. It is in the provision of other outlets than agriculture for her labour—not in interfering between landlord and tenant, and forcing terms into contracts which they have never agreed on—that the real remedy for so much as is genuine in the cry for compulsory compensation for improvements is to be found; and these things, as we have already said, Irishmen have now in their own hands, and no one else can do for them. They can emigrate; they can, if they will, live peaceably and quietly; they can give up combining and conspiring, and then, but not till then, the capital of England—which is even now seeking investment and finding none—will fertilise their shores. The effect of such a change would soon settle the improvement

 question

question. Having something beyond the land to look to, the Irishman would no longer approach his landlord as a suppliant but as an equal; and those provisions in favour of the cultivator which it is sought to force upon the landlord would be agreed to in the only way that can make them permanently binding and useful by open contract between free men dealing on an equality. It is in the creation of this equality, by offering an alternative, that the real remedy for Irish land-grievances lies. This is not in the power of law but of the people. They create the misery of which they complain, and then attribute it to every other cause in the world except the true one, themselves.

We come now to the second question. Is compensation for improvements desirable as tending to establish fixity of tenure and to reduce the landlord to a mere recipient of rent without power over the land? That the concession of compensation would have this effect we have no doubt. The natural answer of a landlord to a tenant-at-will seeking to enforce compensation for improvements would be a notice to quit. It would be argued with irresistible force that the tenure was too slight to support the right which the law had annexed to it, that the right had been conceded, that as we cannot go back we must go forward and give a tenure of a more durable nature in order to support the right to compensation. Is it then desirable that by force of law leases should be lengthened in Ireland? For reasons already given we put aside the agricultural part of the question, but we cannot put aside that of which there is the amplest experience, that nowhere is cultivation so bad and over population and misery so rife as in lands in Ireland let on long leases. The whole family, generation after generation, enter in and dwell there. Subdivision is carried to its utmost limit, and poverty and misery reign without remedy or hope. Here is the opinion of O'Connell himself on the point in 1843:—

'A more absurd and unjust plan I never heard of: it does not do anything for the labourer of the country; it transfers the fee-simple from the present proprietor to the present occupier of large farms; it is, in fact, creating a smaller monopoly than the former one, but equally mischievous in its nature.'

So with regard to all schemes for the subdivision of the ownership of large estates. The result will be just the same, whether the permanent ownership be obtained by means of a cry for compensation for improvements made without the consent of the landlord; or by buying out large landholders at a greater price than their land is worth, as proposed by Mr. Bright; or by turning them out by a simple act of confiscation, as proposed by Mr. Hughes. You put into action a set of causes which must infallibly

infallibly drag Ireland down to the fearful position she held before 1846. You will give her back her lost millions, to be swept away by another famine. Middle subletting, subdivision, conacre would return. Land, instead of the parent of wealth, would become the teeming mother of new poverty and new wretchedness. The largest landlords in Ireland are generally the best. When we have at a great loss to the Exchequer bought up these great estates and cut them up into allotments, what security have we that the poorer men who succeed will be better landlords than those whom we have displaced at a large expense, in which Ireland must bear her quota? Who deal more hardly with the tenant, the rich proprietors who have inherited the land, or the small capitalists who buy it for an investment, determined to wring every shilling out of it and to use to the utmost the power over their tenants which the unnatural demand for the occupation of land puts at their disposal? Who will be pleased? Not the great mass of the nation who will be taxed to pay the difference between the price given and the market value of the land: not the present proprietors, who will be worried out of their ancestral possessions and have a stigma attached to them which they do not deserve: not the new proprietors, who will have to pay the full price for what they buy as ascertained by competition; nor the tenants who will exchange a good landlord for a bad. Thus it seems Mr. Bright's scheme of regeneration will please nobody, and that for the very simple reason that it does nobody any good except the great landholders, who are to have one-tenth more than their land is worth, but who would much rather be left alone. We cannot sum up this matter better than in the words of Mr. Goldwin Smith:—

'Sure I am, that to satisfy Irish disaffection by a measure of tenant-right would be an undertaking at which all ordinary economy and statesmanship would stand aghast. What these people mean by tenant-right is not a rectification of the legal relations between landlord and tenant, or a security to the tenant for the return of his outlay in improvement, but a socialistic alteration of the ownership of land in favour of the tenant—a measure, in plain words, of agrarian confiscation.'

It is even so. While we are told that Ireland, which is in all respects treated as an equal, is the Poland of England—while we are taunted with cruelty and misgovernment, and exhorted to do justice to a grievously oppressed nationality—our difficulty is not to find the will to redress the grievance, but to detect the grievance itself. We are trying hard to put ourselves in the wrong in order that we may have an excuse for doing something to put ourselves in the right. It seems impossible that a country

can go on from year to year in a chronic state of disaffection and smouldering rebellion and yet that there is no fault in the Government; and yet when we seek for the fault in the direction indicated we find it only amounts to this, that we leave the two contending parties, the landlord and tenant, in Ireland as in England, to manage their affairs their own way, and apply to Ireland a rule sanctioned alike by political economy and by our own long and varied experience. The same rule co-exists with good cultivation in England and bad cultivation in Ireland, and we are asked to believe that sixty-four miles of sea make it produce precisely contrary effects. It is more reasonable to seek for the cause elsewhere, and it is to be found in the peculiarities of Irish character, which banish manufacture and commerce from her shores and lead her solely to rely for the support of her people and the increase of her capital on a humid climate and an ungrateful soil.

We have anticipated what we had to say about emigration. Emigration is a blessing or a curse according to the cause which produces it. When a population is driven from a country where work is well paid and the means of living abundant, by tyranny and oppression, as the Moriscoes for instance were driven from Spain, we view one of the blackest scenes of tyranny and oppression, that the human mind can conceive. No one can say—the Fenians themselves do not say—that this is the case of Ireland. We have shown why there is emigration from Ireland. It has been the pleasure of Ireland to pass upon herself a sentence of perpetual poverty. She drives away manufactures by strikes, she frightens away capital by agrarian outrage. While she denounces absenteeism, she makes the position of a resident proprietor almost intolerable. She is at the same time, *par excellence*, the country of early and prolific marriage. To such a country emigration is almost the only possible relief. She cannot feed her children; they must starve at home, or go elsewhere. It is better they should go than starve. But emigration is a palliative of evil rather than in itself a good. It is a grievous though an unavoidable expedient. It breaks up many ties and associations. It leads to confusion between the purely economical causes which produce it and the political causes to which agitators love to ascribe it. Mr. Gladstone has undertaken to check it. He will not succeed; but if he did he would do Ireland the greatest injury imaginable, and destroy the only palliative for her misfortunes. The truth is, this is not an affair of Government. The patient must minister unto himself. If Ireland wishes to retain the youth and strength of the land which is so rapidly ebbing from her, she must provide means for employing

and

and supporting them at home, and those means will be at once forthcoming when she shall cease by every means in her power to drive away those who wish to do her good. Here again we are foiled in the search for a grievance. The State can do nothing. The people have made the evil, and the people alone can remove it.

We now come to the most popular of all the remedies for Irish discontent—the abolition of the Established Church. Our object at present is to discover something practically useful, something that would have an immediate tendency to ameliorate the condition and lighten the discontent of Ireland, and it is from this point of view, and not from the speculative or polemic side of the question, that we accost this much debated subject. We ask ourselves when the abolition of the Church is called for —not as a measure of abstract justice, not on the ground of authority or argument, but as a means of quelling existing discontents—whom will such a change satisfy, what immediate good will it do, how will it better the position of the Irish people, what effect will it have on the relations of Ireland to the rest of the empire? These and such as these are the questions which must be answered before we can consent, in so urgent a crisis as the present, to turn aside from the path of practical utility, in which we are striving to tread, into this interminable controversy. Our first argument shall be stated in the words of Mr. Goldwin Smith. The Protestant garrison in Ireland, with whom we cannot break without gravely imperilling the integrity of the empire, will not hear of such a proposal:—

'We shall no doubt,' he says, 'abolish the Irish Church Establishment. Our moral sense will not allow us to retain it, nor can we afford to go on exciting the sympathy of other nations in favour of Irish disaffection by displaying to the world so palpable an impeachment of our justice. But when this and all the other relics, if any there be, of Protestant ascendancy have been swept away, the pay of the English garrison of Ireland will have been withdrawn and the garrison will probably disband. The Protestants will then become Irishmen, and perhaps, from the independence of character belonging to their creed and race, the most seditious Irishmen of all.'

The case is put very fairly. The destruction of the Church will gratify the moral sense of the English Radicals, but will greatly weaken our hold upon Ireland, and oblige us to supply what Mr. Smith calls our garrison in Ireland by a more direct application of material pressure and military force. The Irish Church has ever been hateful to English Radicals, because it offends their abstract idea of fairness; but it may very reasonably be doubted whether it is equally obnoxious, whether its destruction

tion would give equal satisfaction to any large body of Irishmen. If we are to gather the opinion of Ireland from the representatives whom she returns to Parliament, and we really do not know why we should not, we find a large majority of the representatives in favour of the maintenance of the Established Church. One thing is quite clear, that if there had been anything like unanimity in Ireland on the subject, the Established Church must have been swept away long ago. If it exists now it is because Ireland has never been heartily in earnest in demanding its destruction, and it must always be remembered that the problem before us is not how to conciliate the Radicals of England, but the malcontents of Ireland. On the Fenians of course such a change would make no impression. The Protestants are in general averse to it. The Catholics look on it with mixed feelings, and are unanimous in refusing to share in its spoils. Nor, putting it on the lowest ground, can the change, if made, be regarded as a clear gain. It is something to have in every parish an educated gentleman to interpose between the people, even though not of his own faith and complete barbarism.

Again, if the Church is done away with to-morrow, vested interests for the lives of its present incumbents must, according to all constitutional precedent, be respected. The change must be exceedingly gradual. The money will for many years come in but slowly; and when it does come in, nobody knows what to do with it. The Catholics will have none of it. Education in Ireland is already paid for by the State, instead of as in England in a great measure by private contributors. The police is also paid for from the general revenue, instead of partly out of the rates as in England. But the Church will only fall after a long and heated controversy full of venom and fury, and during that controversy Ireland will both be kept in agitation and receive no substantial benefit. The very fact that no two men are agreed as to what should be done with the money, shows the visionary and speculative nature of a question raised, not to meet any practical grievances, but to satisfy a feeling of disapprobation existing in the minds of some theorising politicians. These considerations are quite independent of the abstract merits of the Irish Church question. They are open alike to its enemies as to its friends; but they seem to show that practical men in search of real remedies for real grievances will not find them in a measure, which will alienate those whom it is our interest to conciliate without conciliating those who are already alienated, which will induce long controversy before it is passed and endless delays after it is passed, and which will only end in presenting us with a sum of money which we do not know what to do with, and which will become in itself a new bone

bone of contention perhaps not less bitter than the original quarrel. Here again we find ourselves at a loss for a practical grievance, and compelled to admit that this popular prescription, be it right or be it wrong, will at any rate have the not unimportant defect that it will not cure nor in any perceptible degree alleviate the disorder to which it is applied.

If we want to do something really beneficial to Ireland, we must search until we find a practical grievance which it is in the power of Government to redress, suffered by the people of Ireland, and not suffered by the people of England and Scotland, or not in the same degree. Such a grievance is not to be found in the tenure of land, nor in emigration, nor in the existence of an establishment devoted to the religion of a small minority. It exists nevertheless, and is capable of complete remedy. The great mass of the people of Ireland are much poorer than the people of England and Scotland, but they have to bear a burden from which the great mass of the people of England and Scotland are exempt. They are forced to defray, out of their poverty and their misery, the expenses of their own clergy. Believing in a religion whose peculiarity it is above all other religions to interpose the priest between man and God—a religion which works entirely through sacerdotal agency, and which looks on the denial of the Sacraments as the most fearful of spiritual privations—the Irish peasant, while the Episcopalian has his Established Church and the Presbyterian his Regium Donum, must bear, without aid from any quarter, the whole burden of his Church. It is not the aid given to the Church of Ireland, it is the aid withheld from the Roman Catholic Church, which is the real grievance of Ireland, the one complaint to which there is no answer, the one evil which we can and do not remedy. It is the accepted policy of the Government of the United Kingdom to provide religious comfort and ministration for the people; and though we cannot or do not extend those ministrations to all sects, we go quite far enough to show that it is not our approval of the doctrine, but our sense of the want, which guides our provision. No position can be more cruel or painful than that of a Roman Catholic priest in Ireland really anxious to do his duty to his flock as a good pastor, and to the State as a good citizen. He must live on their contributions, and therefore he must not point-blank oppose their convictions. He is endeared to them by the uniform law of human nature, which makes us love those whom we benefit, but at the same time he has forced upon him, together with his sacred functions, no little of the functions of a demagogue. He dare not appear as loyal or as peaceable as he really is. He is of the people himself, and naturally even where he leads is also led by

by sympathy, by the desire of popularity, and, it must be admitted, by pecuniary interest. Of course these mixed motives work differently, according to the different characters of mankind. It is enough to say that few men can come out of such an ordeal without some loss of self-respect and without some compliances, and, as it is the fashion to call them, some economies of truth, which they cannot look back upon without regret, and perhaps shame. When we reflect on the vast power possessed by the priest over the education of the young, over the opinions and conduct of the older, over the consciences of all, we cannot sufficiently regret that the Government has allowed such a body of men to exist without making at least an effort to draw them within the circle of its legitimate influence. The real enemy that Ireland has to guard against is not Fenianism, with which the law, and those whose duty it is to put it in force are quite able to deal, but the settled spirit of alienation and disaffection which amid the foolish and distorted traditions of a state of prosperity, splendour, and happiness, that never existed in Ireland, and under the teaching of a priesthood which owes nothing to the English Government, grows up in her cabins and farm-houses. The Catholic priest, so long as the ancient faith exists, must always have at least sufficient influence over his flock. We cannot afford to artificially increase it by forcing upon them the duty of maintaining him side by side with the Episcopalian and Protestant Establishments, as a man proscribed and persecuted, and therefore all the dearer and more venerable.

But it will be said, the Catholic priests will not accept payment from the State. This need not be an immutable decision. At any rate it was not always so. There was a time, as we shall show presently, when the payment of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland was regarded by them in a very different light. But as the Ultramontane element has become stronger in Ireland the indisposition to receive payment from the Government has increased, and now we admit that the bishops profess their unwillingness to receive money from the State. This, however, is no fundamental article of faith, for the Roman Catholics are content in our colonies to receive State support side by side with other denominations, and the Roman Catholic chaplains in prisons in England are already paid. It must also be said that they are quite right to say No till they are fairly asked by persons having the will and the power to obtain this payment for them, which for many years at least has not been the case. It would place the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland in a most unfair and undignified position if they were, after having been so long supported by their own people, to offer themselves as willing to accept a payment which Parliament should

should turn out unwilling to give. But we feel confident that if once really given, it would be, and we will say must be, accepted. The clergy would hardly be willing to take a subsistence from the extreme need and poverty of their flocks, which they could obtain from the overflowing coffers of a wealthy State. And even if they were willing, it is scarcely likely that they would be able. The salary should be paid into a bank, and if a change in the law be required for the purpose, an Act should be passed making the sum so paid in to their credit seizable in execution for debt. Care must be taken to make known to the peasantry of Ireland that the State has taken upon itself to provide for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic clergy, both that the people may see that an act of tardy justice has been at last done, and that, knowing the priest to be otherwise provided for, they may be relieved from the impost which they now bear. We think that a priest questing for his support would meet with little success when his parishioners were once aware that he had other sufficient means at his disposal, and that he preferred begging from the poor to receiving what was honestly his own. They would have little sympathy with a point of honour, the burden of which was all on them and the benefit all on him. The good results from such a measure are manifest. By releasing the priests from absolute dependence on their flocks, it would give them a position of independence such as they have never hitherto enjoyed; it would give them that clear and fair view of Irish questions which can hardly be expected from men whose very existence is not guaranteed them from day to day; it would open the priesthood to a higher and better class of men; and it would take away from them that sense of wrong which must embitter the minds of men who are excluded from the benefits of a social system, over which they nevertheless exercise, and are conscious of exercising, the most critical and decisive influence. To the peasantry it would be a relief from a grievous and most unjust burden. To the wealthier classes it would be a guarantee of the secure possession of their wealth. By England it would be felt as the discharge of a duty, the neglect of which ought to weigh heavily on the national conscience. In the eyes of foreign countries it would vindicate us from the reproach of tyranny and persecution against the religion of Ireland. Of all the remedies for Irish distress, no one is so little insisted on; and yet we think we have shown that it is the one at once the soundest in theory and the most beneficial in practice.

The proposal to pay the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland is not new to the readers of this review. In the 'Quarterly Review' of June, 1845, will be found a proposal, most earnestly argued, for

for paying the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland. The reviewer states his conviction that a State provision for the Roman Catholic clergy is 'the only measure that now offers any reasonable prospect of tranquillising Ireland and cementing and securing the integrity of the empire.' Three-and-twenty years have elapsed since those words were written, but they are as true now as they were then. There is one part of the argument in favour of this provision which no time can change, for it is based on the purest and simplest considerations of good faith. We extract from the 'Review' of June, 1845, a portion of a letter addressed by Mr. Maurice Fitzgerald, the knight of Kerry, to Sir Robert Peel:—

'(Mr. Pitt), contemplating the inherent distractions of Ireland, and well knowing the impossibility of remedying them through a mere domestic parliament, devised the noble expedient of elevating the smaller country by a comprehensive identification with England, including the total abolition of all civil and political disabilities founded on religious grounds. That such were his purposes I can testify; they were communicated to me most unreservedly by Lord Cornwallis. I hold in my hands a confidential letter from Lord Castlereagh, dated 22nd of June, 1802, recognising the pledges given at the Union to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, for which they gave valuable consideration in their support of that measure (without which it could not have been carried), and further instructing me to endeavour to reconcile the heads of their hierarchy to a delay in performance of the engagements made to them by Mr. Pitt's ministry for the endowment of their Church. Dr. Moylan, a justly-venerated prelate, had then recently intimated to Lord Cornwallis the cheerful acquiescence of the Roman Catholic bishops in the endowment of their Church.

'The extension of Regium Donum to the Presbyterians had been just then obtained by Lord Castlereagh; but circumstances of a then very delicate nature, but now well understood, prevented Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Pitt from pressing the Catholic claim. I acted on the negotiation committed to me, and succeeded.

'No man of the slightest political knowledge can doubt that, but for the King's illness and his necessary withdrawal from power, Mr. Pitt could, immediately after the Union, have carried through Parliament with an overwhelming majority of both Houses his measures for the complete political relief of the Roman Catholics and the endowment of their Church; and to Mr. Pitt's intentions on that subject I personally testify on the authority of Lord Cornwallis.'

In 1810, Lord Castlereagh said in the House of Commons, ('Hansard,' May 20, 1810):—

'Upon the ecclesiastical part of the arrangement, he (Lord Castlereagh) was authorised in the year 1799 to communicate with the Catholic clergy.

clergy. It was distinctly understood that the consideration of the political claims of the Catholics must remain for the consideration of the Imperial Parliament; but the expediency of making some provision for their clergy, under proper regulations, was so generally recognised even by those who were adverse to concessions of a political nature, that a communication was officially opened with the heads of their clergy upon this subject.'

And again, in 1821, Lord Castlereagh said—

'That he was authorised under Lord Sidmouth's administration to communicate to the Catholic clergy that it was in contemplation of the Government to make a proposition for a pecuniary provision on their behalf to Parliament. They stated, in the most respectful and disinterested manner, that they could not, consistently with duty and honour, receive such a mark of grace and favour at that moment.'

Clearly meaning that until emancipation was given to the laity the clergy could not in honour receive a State provision for themselves, but also implying that the objection was of a temporary nature, and could, and probably would, be removed. From these extracts it is quite clear that before, during, and after the Union the government of Mr. Pitt, and afterwards of Mr. Addington, were in negotiation with the Roman Catholic clergy on the subject of Catholic Emancipation, and State provision for the priesthood; that in consideration of the offers made by Mr. Pitt's Government, the Catholics gave their consent to the Union, and that the conditions were never accomplished, mainly owing to the unfortunate state of the King's health. The one part, Catholic Lay Emancipation, was tardily and reluctantly granted, shorn of much of the graceful and healing influence which it might have had; the other, a State provision for the clergy, to the eternal discredit of our good faith and national honour, remains unperformed to the present day.

It appears, then, as the result of our investigation, that the idea of finding in legislation any speedy or complete remedy for the discontents of Ireland is a mere delusion; that those discontents spring from causes which legislation did not make and cannot take away; and that the remedy, if ever it is to come, must come in great measure from the Irish people themselves. From this position several practical conclusions of great value flow. In the first place, the true friends of Ireland ought by all means to discourage those rash and violent attempts at change which find so much favour in quarters from which better things might have reasonably been expected. Internal discord, and the want of confidence of English capitalists in Irish investments, are the two causes which give to the land question its exaggerated

gerated and unnatural importance. Till these causes of disorder can be removed, interference with the results that flow from them will only tend to aggravate the evil. No law that can be suggested will diminish them, while anything that tends to diminish the confidence of the wealthier classes in the permanence of the present settlement of property would greatly deepen the two fountains of all mischief, distrust, and discord.

Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright both agree in seeing in the Fenian conspiracy an exhortation to take some decided measure for the contentment of Ireland. Mr. Bright tells us that nothing good has ever been done for her except under pressure, and seems to infer that as the pressure has come the good will speedily follow. Mr. Gladstone, with that passion for self-humiliation which is with him a kind of intermittent fever, says, 'These painful and horrible manifestations may, perhaps, in the merciful designs of Providence—without in the slightest degree acquitting the authors of responsibility—have been intended to invite this nation to greater search of its own heart and spirit and conscience with reference to the condition of Ireland and the legislation affecting that country.' Surely such language as this rises little above the level of cant. It is enough to attribute the cruel outrages of the Fenians to the will of wicked men, without insisting on seeing in them an especial visitation of Providence by which the innocent are tortured, mutilated, and massacred in order to stir the conscience of the guilty. Such a judgment is quite unnecessary, for interest and conviction already plead with irresistible urgency for the doing anything that may conciliate and content Ireland. The difficulty is not in the will but in the power. As far as Fenianism goes, the case is hopeless. We are told plainly that nothing we can do short of absolute separation will appease it. As far as other minor discontents go, the more we examine into them the more we see that they arise from economical and social conditions over which laws are powerless:—

'Quid leges sine moribus
Vanæ proficiunt?'

As for laws and administration, Ireland is on the same footing as England; and, where there is a difference, Ireland will be found to be better cared for than England. She has a lighter taxation; a better system of primary education; a middle-class university system wholly supported by the State—a want severely felt at this moment in England; a police quite equal alone, though mainly composed of Irish Catholics, to deal with the Fenians, entirely supported by the State. Irishmen sit on the English

English bench; for many years an Irish Prime Minister directed the affairs of the United Kingdom; an Irish General commanded our armies in the great French War; Irishmen govern our colonies; Irishmen direct our diplomacy; Irishmen fill our Indian and home services. Not only are they theoretically equal, the theory is reduced into the most literal practice. They are, to all intents and purposes—

'Participes libertatis Sceptrique Britanni.'

We may say to the Irish, in the words of Cerealis to the Gauls, in the Fourth Book of Tacitus's History, 'Ipsi plerumque legionibus nostris præsidetis, ipsi has aliasque provincias regitis, nihil separatum clausumve.' The whole policy of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has changed towards us just in proportion to our efforts to conciliate it. Instead of being national it has become ultramontane; but we have kept our temper. We have been vexed by endless and objectless conspiracies, but only where life has actually been taken have we taken life. It is a little too much for persons conscious of so much forbearance, so much goodwill and self-command, to be called upon by Mr. Bright and Mr. Gladstone to put on the white sheet, to beat their breasts, to utter 'Meâ culpâ' and 'confiteor,' and virtually to assume to themselves the blame, because a set of desperate ruffians who have emancipated themselves from all laws, human and divine, are disturbing a peaceful country by their murders and explosions. It is the duty of all parties to strengthen the hands of the Government; and the way to do that is not to relieve the Fenian conspirators of one jot of responsibility by seeking to trace their outrages to our faults, but to depict them as they really are—enemies of the human race, whose crimes would have been scarcely less detestable had they been perpetrated in the blackest period of Irish history, instead of now when every serious grievance has been long removed. Nay, we will go further, and say that, so far from having any just cause of quarrel with us, we have laid and are laying Ireland under the deepest obligations. The sword of Damocles hangs over her head, and we are the single hair that keeps it from falling upon her. Suppose these reckless adventurers to gain their ends; suppose the mediating and pacifying power of England finally withdrawn; what future would be open for Ireland? A total wreck of all property and credit; a desperate civil war, which would soon show the world how entirely the mission of England had been one of peace and conciliation; and ultimate subjection to some foreign Power, whose rule would teach Ireland the real meaning of the complaints made in her name against us with

with so much levity and so much injustice. The difference between the state of peace and order in which, contrary to the desire of so many of her people, we maintain her, and the anarchy, bloodshed, and ruin we have described, is the measure of the obligations of Ireland to this country. We are conscious, if not of the good we are able to do, at least of the evil we prevent, and refuse to follow Mr. Gladstone in his confessions of wrong and injustice towards a people who are saved by our agency alone from the most fearful and ruinous calamities.

THE

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

ART. I.—1. *The Works of Lord Macaulay complete.* Edited by his sister, Lady Trevelyan. 8 vols. 8vo. London. 1866.

2. *The New Examen; or an Inquiry into the Evidence relating to certain Passages in Lord Macaulay's History.* By John Paget, Barrister-at-Law. Edinburgh and London. 1861.

THE time has come when we feel bound to enter a firm protest against a species of hero-worship which cannot fail to demoralise and discredit the republic of letters, if it spreads. The worshippers at the Macaulay shrine will not rest satisfied with the ready, nay eager, recognition of their idol as the most brilliant and popular essayist and historian of the age. They peremptorily insist on his infallibility. There is to be no appeal from his judgments. As who should say, 'I am Sir Oracle.' In apparent imitation of a familiar practice on board ship when the hour is reported, no sooner has he pronounced an opinion or inference, than his votaries exclaim in chorus, 'make it so.' Woe to the critics who presume to claim the right of private judgment, or dare to unsettle what he has pronounced to be settled. They will be ignored, hustled on one side, or misrepresented; whilst the original false creed or theory will be confidently set forth anew as if nothing ever had, or ever could be, urged against it. What makes the school or clique to which we allude especially formidable and mischievous, is its respectability; comprising, as it does, several distinguished men of letters, and having for its organ a Review of long-established influence and reputation. Nor does it much mend the matter that they are acting conscientiously, and do not even seem aware that they risk any loss of literary reputation, although ready to go any lengths rather than admit that they have erred with their master.

When a lady asked Dr. Johnson how he came to commit a palpable blunder in his 'Dictionary,' he replied: 'Ignorance, Ma'am, pure ignorance.' Lord Macaulay was never seduced into such a display of frankness, although he could have afforded it equally well. It was a point of honour with him never to admit an error; and his disciples manfully maintain to this hour that he never was guilty of one. There has been enough of this. We have a duty to perform, though we are well aware that it

 is

is an invidious and a difficult one. Almost all readers feel the charm of Lord Macaulay's eloquence,—of his rich imagination, his descriptive powers, his gorgeous rhetoric, his glow, grasp, and comprehensiveness,—but very few care to inquire about the evidence upon which his splendid declamations rest. Examination of evidence in a critical spirit is to most persons repulsive, and it is always difficult to undertake the support of reasoned truth against eloquent sentiment. We have, moreover, to contend, in the present case, not only against the 'vulgi indiligentia veri'—the dislike which the majority always feel to the investigation of truth*—but against an established admiration, which in many minds rises to something like a religious sentiment. It is no pleasure to us, we can assure our readers, to dwell upon the failings of an eminent writer whose loss we all deplore, and who has left behind him a large circle of attached and ardent admirers; but we cannot stand by and allow arrogant assumptions and transparent sophistries to be produced as decisive of a controversy because Lord Macaulay has set his seal upon them. The time can hardly come when his picturesque and luminous pages will cease to be devoured with avidity by the most intellectual and impressible class of readers; and these, above all others, should be forewarned that a most attractive and instructive companion may prove a very unsafe counsellor or guide.

We may as well say at starting that we do not accuse Lord Macaulay of conscious misrepresentation or premeditated wrong. He was a man of an ardent generous nature, with high aspirations for human progress, a deep sense of justice, and a vehement hatred of oppression. Indeed, it was the very depth and strength of his moral and political convictions that so frequently warped his judgment: he could see no good in any one who he thought upheld tyranny or bigotry, no harm in any one who seemed to him to promote civil and religious freedom. By some peculiarity of his mental constitution he was also singularly impatient of uncertainty: like sundry recent converts or perverts that shall be nameless, he hurried into dogmatism to escape doubt. He could never be made to understand that there are whole classes of subjects on which certainty is unattainable: questions to which, instead of saying yes or no, we are compelled to give a qualified reply. It was in reference to this peculiarity, as displayed in the Cabinet, that Lord Melbourne remarked: 'Macaulay is always so cock-sure of everything.' We were instantly reminded

* The dictum of Thucydides is as true now as it was in his day,—*οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος τοῖς πολλοῖς ἡ ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἑτοῖμα μᾶλλον τρέπονται.*—20.)

of

of him by the passage in which a great contemporary warns both readers and writers against the tendency 'to break loose from the unseen spell by which a conscientious criticism binds them down—to screw up the possible and probable into certainty, to suppress counter-balancing considerations, and to substitute a *pleasing romance* in place of half-known and perplexing realities.'*

Then, there was his notorious fondness for the dramatic or melodramatic in composition, for telling contrasts and picturesque details—that meretricious taste, that vanity of style, by which an author may be as dangerously misled as a woman by vanity of dress. Effect was to him what 'Action' was to Demosthenes, or *l'audace, toujours l'audace* to Danton—his aim, his end, his principle, his condition and criterion of success. The artistic delineations and descriptions on which he prided himself have been compared to Rembrandt pictures, made up of dazzling lights and deep shades: a comparison which suggests that, whilst the painter may select subjects adapted to his peculiar talent, the historian must take scenes and characters as they present themselves, and paint them with the fidelity of truth. Lord Macaulay does not seem to know what an unvarnished narrative, a graduated tone, or a neutral tint means: he has only black and white, with two or three of the most showy colours, on his palette; and as he dashes them on his canvas with the impetuosity of creative genius, the results are too often mere fancy pieces, not drawings from nature or portraits from the life. But nature abhors a violent contrast almost as much as she is said to abhor a vacuum; whilst spotless patriots and black-and-all-black villains are as rare as giants and dwarfs in life—

> 'Virtuous and vicious ev'ry man must be,
> Few in the extreme, but all in the degree.'

He was so apt to let his imagination run away with him, that we constantly find him employing it to expand and gild truisms or amplify commonplaces. Take, for example, the eloquent description of the battle of Landen, in the course of which he expatiates, through the best part of a page, on the diminished importance of bodily strength in a commander in consequence of the invention of gunpowder; winding up with an eminently characteristic exaggeration of the personal defects of Luxembourg and King William:—

'It is probable that, among the hundred and twenty thousand soldiers who were marshalled round Neerwinden under all the

* 'Grote's History of Greece,' vol. i., Preface, p. x.

standards of Western Europe, the two feeblest in body were the hunchbacked dwarf who urged forward the fiery onset of France, and the asthmatic skeleton who covered the slow retreat of England.'—('Works,' vol. iv. p. 24.*)

Or, take the passage in which the evils of a debased currency are contrasted with the evils of misgovernment:

'The misgovernment of Charles and James, gross as it had been, had not prevented the common business of life from going steadily and prosperously on. While the honour and independence of the State were sold to a foreign Power, while chartered rights were invaded, while fundamental laws were violated, hundreds of thousands of quiet, honest, and industrious families laboured and traded, ate their meals and lay down to rest, in comfort and security. Whether Whig or Tories, Protestants or Jesuits were uppermost, the grazier drove his beasts to market; the grocer weighed out his currants; the draper measured out his broadcloth; the hum of buyers and sellers was as loud as ever in the towns; the harvest-home was celebrated as joyously as ever in the hamlets; the cream overflowed the pails of Cheshire; the apple juice foamed in the presses of Herefordshire; the piles of crockery glowed in the furnaces of the Trent; and the barrows of coal rolled fast along the timber railways of the Tyne.'—(Vol. iv. p. 189.)

There is no reason why this rhetorical diarrhœa should ever stop so long as there was a trade, calling, or occupation to be particularised: the pith of the proposition (which required no proof) being contained in the first sentence. Why not continue thus:—

'The apothecary vended his drugs as usual; the poulterer crammed his turkeys; the fishmonger skinned his eels; the wine-merchant adulterated his port; as many hot-cross buns as ever were eaten on Good Friday, as many pancakes on Shrove Tuesday, as many Christmas-pies on Christmas-day; on area steps the domestic drudge took in her daily pennyworth of the chalky mixture which Londoners call milk; through area bars the feline tribe, vigilant as ever, watched the arrival of the cats'-meat man; the painted courtesan flaunted in the Haymarket; the cabs rattled through the Strand; and from the suburban regions of Fulham and Putney the cart of the market-gardener wended its slow and midnight way along Piccadilly to deposit its load of cabbages and turnips in Covent Garden.'

Practice makes perfect: this style of writing is easy enough when one has caught the trick of it; and there are other minor beauties of Lord Macaulay which his successors need not despair of rivalling if they take pains: *e.g.*, his mode of stating that wild animals were more numerous in England when rights

* All the references are made to the last edition of Lord Macaulay's Works *placed at the* head of this article.

of

of forest were strictly maintained and half of what is now arable and pasture was uninclosed:

'The wild bull with his white mane was still to be found wandering in a few of the southern forests. The badger made his dark and tortuous hole on the side of every hill where the copsewood grew thick. The wild cats were frequently heard by night wailing round the lodges of the rangers of Whittlebury and Needwood. The yellow-breasted marten was still pursued in Cranbourne Chase for his fur, reputed inferior only to that of the sable. Fen eagles, measuring more than nine feet between the extremities of the wings, preyed on fish along the coast of Norfolk.'—(Vol. i. p. 245.)

This mode of describing the animal creation had been already employed in the 'Antijacobin:'—

'The feather'd race with pinions skim the air,
Not so the mackerel, and still less the bear:
This roams the wood, carniv'rous for his prey;
That with soft roe pursues his watery way.
This, slain by hunters, yields his shaggy hide;
That, caught by fishers, is on Sundays cried.'

The most gorgeous of Lord Macaulay's descriptive pieces is undoubtedly the Hastings Trial in Westminster Hall, with the procession and the *catalogue raisonné* of the company. The varied knowledge and richness of imagination expended in the composition are undeniable; yet when it was highly praised before the late Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, whose worship was confined to ancient altars, he dryly remarked that it smacked strongly of the showman and the auctioneer.

Redundancy of ornament and glittering superfluity of illustration, however, afford no ground for regret or complaint. It is to the much more serious abuse of this illustrious writer's gifts that we attribute a gradually accelerated decline in his authority, which may lead to a grave deduction from his fame. The judgment of foreign nations may be accepted as a tolerably fair sample of the judgment of posterity. Already, both on the Continent and in the United States, Lord Macaulay is almost always quoted with qualification or reserve; and we have been anticipated in the line of argument we propose to pursue by several writers of learning and ability, to whose scattered discoveries and comments we hope to give fresh point and strength by concentrating them. Foremost amongst these stands Mr. Paget, the author of 'The New Examen,' who has brought to the task a rare amount of sagacity and research, and in numerous instances has (in our humble judgment) convicted the Whig oracle

oracle of inexcusable misstatement or suppression of facts. Nor are these ordinary, accidental, or insulated mistakes—

'quas aut incuria fudit
Aut humana parum cavit natura.'

The aberrations of which we especially complain are the fruit of the manner of writing which he systematically pursued: they may be traced to his most marked qualities; wide views, sweeping conclusions, rules of conduct, dogmas of faith, principles of policy, are based upon them: they are among the chief materials and instruments with which he constructs or destroys reputation. The proposed inquiry, therefore, involves much more than the accuracy of a great author. The characters of nations, classes, kings, statesmen and heroes are involved; and it is in the full sense of no common responsibility that we proceed.

We begin with the celebrated account of the Highlands, which, as we are opportunely reminded, is all the more startling as coming from one who is by direct descent a Highlander. After referring to Lord Macaulay's pedigree as set forth in the Peerage, which gives him a Highland minister and a Bristol Quaker for paternal and maternal grandfathers respectively, Mr. Paget proceeds:—

'With Highland and Quaker blood flowing in equal currents through his veins, it is difficult to say whether a Highlander or a Quaker is the more favourite object of his satire and butt for the shafts of his ridicule; whether George Fox or Coll of the Cows comes in for the larger share of his contempt; whether the enthusiast who felt himself divinely moved to take off what we are in the habit of considering as the most essential of all garments, and to walk in the simplicity of nature through the town of Skipton, or the native of the Grampians, who never possessed such an article of dress at all, is the more ridiculous in his eyes; whether, in short, he despises most those who gave birth to his father or his mother. It is with the paternal ancestors of the historian that we have at present to do. No quarrel is so bitter as a family quarrel; when a man takes to abusing his father or his mother, he does it with infinitely greater gusto than a mere stranger. Lord Macaulay's description of the Highlands is accordingly so vituperative, so spiteful, so grotesque—it displays such command of the language of hatred, and such astounding power of abuse, that, coming as it does from a writer who challenges a place by the side of Hume and Gibbon, it takes the breath away, and one feels almost as one would on receiving a torrent of blasphemy from a Bishop, or ribaldry from a Judge, or a volley of oaths from a young lady whose crinoline one had just piloted, with the utmost respect, tenderness, and difficulty, to her place at the dinner-table.'—('The New Examen,' p. 150.)

We

We do not believe that Lord Macaulay was animated by the smallest spice of animosity or spite. The only Scotchmen who did not manifest an honest pride in him on all occasions, or of whom he had ever even temporary reason to complain, were the lowland voters of Edinburgh, who amply redeemed in 1852 the folly and injustice of his rejection in 1847. He had no quarrel, public or private, to avenge, and no motive for vituperation. His sole object was effect, which in this instance could only be obtained by the peculiar mode of treatment he pursued. The general state of the Highlands towards the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth was well known to the readers of 'Old Mortality' and 'Rob Roy.' It was confessedly the charm, the halo, flung over them by the great enchanter of the North, that first made their lakes and glens the favourite resort of tourists; and it is an undoubted truth that the taste for wild scenery, real or affected, is seldom largely indulged at the cost of personal discomfort or risk. The start of a London family for the Trosachs or Glencoe is invariably prefaced by a prosaic inquiry touching inns. But what is the use of repeating familiar facts in plain language, when they can be rhetorically dressed up in a manner to produce all the excitement and interest of a sensational novel or a melodrame —

'It is not easy for a modern Englishman, who can pass in a day from his club in Saint James's Street to his shooting-box among the Grampians, and who finds in his shooting-box all the comforts and luxuries of his club, to believe that, in the time of his greatgrandfathers, Saint James's Street had as little connexion with the Grampians as with the Andes. Yet so it was. In the south of our island scarcely anything was known about the Celtic part of Scotland; and what was known excited no feeling but contempt and loathing. The crags and the glens, the woods and the waters, were indeed the same that now swarm every autumn with admiring gazers and sketchers. The Trosachs wound as now between gigantic walls of rock tapestried with broom and wild roses; Foyers came headlong down through the birchwood with the same leap and the same roar with which he still rushes to Loch Ness; and, in defiance of the sun of June, the snowy scalp of Ben Cruachan rose, as it still rises, over the willowy islets of Loch Awe. Yet none of these sights had power, till a recent period, to attract a single poet or painter from more opulent and more tranquil regions. Indeed, law and police, trade and industry, have done far more than people of romantic dispositions will readily admit to develope in our minds a sense of the wilder beauties of nature. A traveller must be freed from all apprehension of being murdered or starved before he can be charmed by the bold outlines and rich tints of the hills. He is not likely to be thrown into ecstasies by the abruptness of a precipice from which he is in imminent danger of falling two thousand feet perpendicular; by the boiling waves of a torre

torrent which suddenly whirls away his baggage, and forces him to run for his life; by the gloomy grandeur of a pass where he finds a corpse which marauders have just stripped and mangled; or by the screams of those eagles whose next meal may probably be on his own eyes.'—(Vol. iii. p. 42.)

The artistic merit of this paragraph is such that many of our readers will thank us for bringing it under their notice, quite independently of its value as an illustration. But when they have sufficiently admired the rich tints of the picture, let them calmly weigh its truth and the justness of the general impression left by it. The precipices are just as high and the rivers quite as liable to a sudden rise or *spate* as they were two hundred years ago; and at the time in question the traveller or stranger ran far less danger from marauders in the Highlands than in the metropolis, 'kept in constant terror by housebreakers,' or on the high roads of England, 'made almost impassable by freebooters.' These are Lord Macaulay's words in describing the state of England in 1692. In the Highlands in 1692, distracted as they were by feuds, the crimes of highway robbery and housebreaking were almost unknown; and, under the patriarchal rule, any clansman who plundered a traveller would speedily have experienced the rude and ready justice of the chiefs. But let us hear what sort of accommodation an English traveller in the Highlands would have found about the same period; if he and his baggage were not whirled away in a torrent, or his corpse stripped and mangled by marauders, or his eyes picked out by eagles:—

'He would have had to endure hardships as great as if he had sojourned among the Esquimaux or the Samoyeds. Here and there, indeed, at the castle of some great lord who had a seat in the Parliament and Privy Council, and who was accustomed to pass a large part of his life in the cities of the South, might have been found wigs and embroidered coats, plate, and fine linen, lace and jewels, French dishes and French wines. But, in general, the traveller would have been forced to content himself with very different quarters. In many dwellings the furniture, the food, the clothing, nay, the very hair and skin of his hosts would have put his philosophy to the proof. His lodging would sometimes have been in a hut of which every nook would have swarmed with vermin. He would have inhaled an atmosphere thick with peat-smoke, and foul with a hundred noisome exhalations. At supper grain fit only for horses would have been set before him, accompanied by a cake of blood drawn from living cows. Some of the company with which he would have feasted would have been covered with cutaneous eruptions, and others would have been smeared with tar like sheep. His couch would have been the bare earth, dry or wet as the weather might be; and from that couch he would

would have risen half poisoned with stench, half blind with the reek of turf, and half mad with the itch.'—(Vol. iii. p. 46.)

There is a remarkable note to this passage:—

'Almost all these circumstances are taken from Burt's Letters. For the tar, I am indebted to Cleland's poetry. In his verses on the "Highland Host" he says:

> "The reason is, they're smeared with tar,
> Which doth defend their head and neck,
> Just as it doth their sheep protect."'

Before examining how far the statements in the text are supported by these authorities, let us weigh their internal probability and their agreement with universal laws and conditions of society. The writer would fain lead us to believe that there was nothing intermediate between wasteful luxury and squalid poverty, between the castle of some great lord who had a seat in the Parliament and the Privy Council, and the hut of the lowest peasant. We doubt whether such a state of things ever existed anywhere; we are quite sure that it never existed, except in some out-of-the-way corner, in the Highlands, where landed property was formerly much more divided than since the territorial aggrandisement of several great houses, and the extinction or merger of so many of the clans. There is extant a sumptuary law of the time of James I. restricting the consumption of claret or French wine in the Highlands and islands, issued by the Scotch Privy Council, who can hardly have framed it with exclusive reference to the great lords who sate at their board. The term 'castle' in the Highlands corresponds pretty nearly with *château* or country-house. Judging from the castles still standing or the remains, we should say that, at the period of which Lord Macaulay speaks, an English visitor, properly recommended, would have been passed on from castle to castle at distances of ten, fifteen, to twenty miles at the farthest, and might have seen everything which is now thought worth seeing with little more hardship or discomfort than was experienced by Dr. Johnson and Boswell in their tour.

Burt, an officer in the army quartered at Inverness about 1725, is quite as loud in his complaints of the lack of English comfort and cleanliness in the Lowlands as in the Highlands, but his experience of houses of public entertainment in the far North is limited to two instances. In the course of an expedition to attend a meeting of chiefs, he was driven by stress of weather to pass the night in what he calls a hut.

'My fare,' he says, 'was a couple of roasted hens (as they call them), very poor, new killed, the skins much broken with plucking, black

black with smoke, and greased with bad butter. As I had no great appetite to that dish, I spoke for some hard eggs, made my supper of the yolks, and washed them down with a *bottle of good small claret.* My bed had clean sheets and blankets. . . . For want of anything more proper for breakfast. I took up with a little brandy, water, sugar, and yolks of eggs beat up together, which I think they called "old man's milk."'

Here the gravamen lay in the cooking. But the roasted hens were not worse than the famous leg of mutton on which Dr. Johnson dined between London and Oxford, 'ill fed, ill killed, ill kept, and ill dressed;' and the clean sheets and blankets, with the good small claret, were compensating circumstances of which Lord Macaulay apparently lost sight. In the second instance, Captain Burt found wholesome food, and on retiring to rest was shown into a separate hut or cabin where there was no reek of turf and no companion to communicate the itch. Though housed in the very lowest kind of Highland caravansary, he contradicts or discredits almost all the circumstances of the very statement he is cited to confirm; and whilst on this subject, Lord Macaulay (who places so much reliance on works of fiction) might surely have remembered the Clachan of Aberfoil at which Frank Osbaldistone and Baillie Nicol Jarvie were contented to put up.

But the question is not confined to the public-houses. The impression intended to be conveyed is that the generality of dwellings were on a par with the most miserable huts, in which the company, smeared with tar and covered with cutaneous eruptions, feasted on grain fit only for horses (to wit, oat-cake) and cakes of blood drawn from living cows. The cake of oats and cow's-blood is mentioned by Burt as a resource of the lowest class of Highlanders in seasons of extraordinary scarcity. He does not say that it was set before him; and our horror at the thought of such an article of food was materially mitigated by thinking of the dish of hog's-blood, indicative of black-pudding, which the landlady (in 'Joseph Andrews') threw over Parson Adams.

The smearing of the skin with tar, by way of waterproofing we suppose, would require a graver authority than Cleland's burlesque verses. In allusion to its having been said of or by Fouché, that, give him a line of a man's handwriting and he would engage to ruin him, it has been said, 'Give Lord Macaulay an insulated fact or phrase, a scrap of a journal, or the tag end of a song, and on it, by the abused prerogative of genius, he would construct a theory of national or personal character which should confer undying glory or inflict indelible disgrace.' The tar theory, for which he tells us

us he was indebted to Cleland's doggrel, is an apt exemplification of this remark. A conclusive answer to the worst imputation on the Highlander is supplied by the historian's own witness, Captain Burt:—

'Personal robberies are seldom heard of among them. For my own part, I have several times, with a single servant, passed the mountain-way from hence to Edinburgh with four or five hundred guineas in my portmanteau, without any apprehension of robbers by the way, or danger in my lodgings at night; though in my sleep any one, with ease, might have thrust a sword from the outside through the wall of the hut and my body together. *I wish we could say as much of our own country, civilised as it is said to be, though we cannot be safe in going from London to Highgate.*'

Is it a palliation, or the contrary, that in the very next paragraph the same fondness for effect leads Lord Macaulay to invest the same people with a degree of refinement and nobility of feeling, a spirit of honour, and a grace of manner, utterly incompatible with the sordid and degrading habits he had exerted his finest rhetoric to fix upon them? A cattle lifter, a Rob Roy or Donald Bean, driving the herds of a lowland farmer, is put upon a level with a Raleigh or a Drake dividing the cargoes of Spanish galleons; and we are assured that 'a gentleman of Sky or Lochaber, whose clothes were begrimed with the accumulated filth of years, and whose hovel smelt worse than an English hog-stye, would do the honours of that hovel with a lofty courtesy worthy of the splendid circle of Versailles.' This is the sketch of a Red Indian chief, clothed in a blanket, and doing the honours of his wigwam with the natural dignity so often seen in savages, not that of a 'gentleman' of Sky or Lochaber.

'It is often difficult,' remarks Mr. Paget, 'and sometimes impossible, to divine what particular qualities will arouse Lord Macaulay's animosity. The virtues which receive the tribute of admiration and respect when they are found in one man, appear to excite nothing but contempt when they are met with in another; and, in like manner, the vices which in one are venial transgressions, chargeable rather on the age than on the individual, become disgraceful offences or foul crimes in another.'

It may be difficult to divine what particular qualities will provoke this inequality of treatment; but it is easy to foretell whether any given line of conduct will be palliated or condemned when we know whether it was pursued by a Whig or a Tory, by King William or King James. It may be doubted whether the Commissioners of Irish Forfeitures in 1700 would have been censured for exceeding their commission if they had brought to light an extravagant grant to Arabella Churchill, or Catherine Sedley, instead

stead of one to Elizabeth Villiers. In allusion to the ugliness of his brother's mistresses, Charles the Second used to say that they must have been assigned him by way of penance by his confessor. Yet Charles well knew the incident by which Arabella Churchill first attracted notice, notwithstanding the plainness of her face; and Lord Macaulay, who read it in Grammont, might have spared the repeated sneers at the exiled monarch's bad taste, if only because his successful rival and son-in-law was completely on a par with him in this respect. He might also have remembered, when denouncing the criminality of James's connection with Catherine Sedley, that she was a woman of superior talents and gave him excellent advice; for the same sort of palliation is suggested for William:—

'For a time William was a negligent husband. He was, indeed, drawn away from his wife by other women, particularly by one of her ladies, Elizabeth Villiers, who, though destitute of personal attractions, and disfigured by a hideous squint, *possessed talents which well fitted her to partake his cares.* He was indeed ashamed of his errors, and spared no pains to conceal them; but, in spite of all his precautions, Mary well knew that he was not strictly faithful to her.'—(Vol. ii. p. 10.)

We hardly understand what is meant by William's being ashamed of his errors, and sparing no pains to conceal them, when we read in a subsequent page:—

'She [Elizabeth Villiers] had been [in 1700] some years married to George Hamilton, a soldier who had distinguished himself by his courage in Ireland and Flanders, and who probably held the courtier-like doctrine that a lady is not dishonoured by having been the paramour of a king. William was well pleased with the marriage, bestowed on the wife a portion of the old Crown property in Ireland, and created the husband a peer of Scotland by the title of Earl of Orkney.'—(Vol. iv. p. 523.)

Compare this with the eloquent paragraphs (chap. vi.) in which the 'criminal' infatuation of James, in making Catherine Sedley a countess, is denounced. The grant to the Countess of Orkney was out of the hereditary revenue of the Crown, not out of the forfeited estates; and therefore, in the opinion of the historian, should have been left unnoticed by the Commissioners, who were told that, if they went out of their way to hold it up to obloquy, they might be justly said to fly in the king's face:—

'"To fly in the King's face!" said one of the majority; "our business is to fly in the King's face. We were sent here to fly in the King's face." With this patriotic object a paragraph about Lady Orkney's grant was added to the Report, a paragraph too in which the value of that grant was so monstrously exaggerated that William appeared to have surpassed the profligate extravagance of his uncle Charles.

Charles. The estate bestowed on the Countess was valued at 24,000*l.* a year. The truth seems to be that the income which she derived from the royal bounty, after making allowance for incumbrances and for the rate of exchange, was about 4000*l.*'—(Vol. iv. p. 524.)

The character of the grant does not depend upon the amount. Doubtless the Commissioners made the most of their discovery; but for all that, we should like to see the figures by which, after allowing for incumbrances and Irish currency, their twenty-four thousand was reduced to four. In grants to his Dutch followers, William fully equalled the profligate extravagance of his uncle. The Royal bounty speedily made Bentinck one of the richest peers in England, and was still in full flow, when the House of Commons interposed to prevent the grant of an estate in Wales worth more than a hundred thousand pounds, without reckoning the extensive royalties appertaining to it.

Like Hume's leaning to prerogative, or Gibbon's scepticism, or Mr. Buckle's materialism, or Mr. Kinglake's anti-Napoleonic tendencies, Lord Macaulay's partiality for William disturbs and colours the whole current of his history. Whether it be or be not the mark of genius to have strong sympathies and antipathies, it is clearly the duty of the critic to take note of them. One of the strongest instances of uncompromising advocacy, as contradistinguished from the judicial summary of facts which we were entitled to expect, is the vindication of William's part in the massacre of Glencoe. The true character of this transaction should be fresh in the recollection of the reader to enable him to appreciate the gloss; and the details are not at all softened by the historian: they are too well suited to his style, too well fitted to give life, colour and individuality to his pages to be softened by him.

There is no portion of his work more remarkable for penetration and originality than that in which he analyses the party divisions of the Highlands, and shows that they had little or no reference to dynasties. The civil war in that quarter was really a war between the Campbells and the clans who refused to acknowledge their supremacy. The clan of Glencoe, a branch of the Macdonalds, the hereditary enemies of the Campbells, had been in arms for King James, but on finding his cause hopeless had come to terms like the rest. They consisted of about three hundred men, women, and children: fifty being the quota of fighting men for which they were rated in the muster-roll of the confederacy. Their chief, Mac Ian, is mentioned in the 'Memoirs of Lochiel' as 'a person of great integrity, honour, good nature, and courage, . . . much loved by his neighbours, and blameless in his conduct.' Lord Macaulay says of him:—

'His

'His own vassals, indeed, were few in number; but he came of the best blood of the Highlands. He kept up a close connexion with his more powerful kinsmen; nor did they like him the less because he was a robber, for he never robbed them; and that robbery, merely as robbery, was a wicked and disgraceful act, had never entered into the mind of any Celtic chief. Mac Ian was therefore held in high esteem by the confederates. His age was venerable; his aspect was majestic; and he possessed in large measure those intellectual qualities which, in rude societies, give men an ascendency over their fellows.'—(Vol. iii. p. 515.)

It is vital to the argument, before going further, to fix what is to be understood by robbers and robbery when speaking of the clans, for Lord Macaulay shifts and reverses the meaning of these terms in the most embarrassing manner accordingly as he wishes to degrade or elevate. Precisely the same class of persons who are compared to the companions of Raleigh and Drake in one chapter will be found identified with Bedouins, Italian banditti, or Thugs in another.* When the clans were at feud, they harried one another; in other words, they waged war by predatory expeditions and reprisals. The moss-trooper who plundered on his own account belonged to the border or debateable land, and was quite as likely to be an Englishman as a Scotchman. As already shown, there was far more highway robbery south than north of the Forth. Whom were the men of Glencoe to rob except their neighbours and kinsmen, whom we are told they did not rob? or the Campbells, whom they could not rob without instantly provoking a terrible retaliation? They were separated by a wide interval of difficult country from richer districts; and when Lord Macaulay talks of 'a quiet and industrious population' suffering from their depredations, he raises a doubt whether he was accurately acquainted with the locality, or even with the state of the Highlands at the time. The situation of the glen is conclusive on these points; and besides the pass, Mac Ian's domain included the land where the valley opens towards Fort William. The live stock of the clan amounted

* 'Yet those erred greatly who imagined that he [the Highlander] bore any resemblance to villains who, in rich and well governed communities, live by stealing. When he drove before him the herds of Lowland farmers up the pass which led to his native glen, he no more considered himself as a thief than the Raleighs and Drakes considered themselves as thieves when they divided the cargoes of Spanish galleons. He was a warrior seizing lawful prize of war, of war never once intermitted during the thirty-five generations which had passed away since the Teutonic invaders had driven the children of the soil to the mountains. That, if he was caught robbing on such principles, he should, for the protection of peaceful industry, be punished with the utmost rigour of the law was perfectly just. But it was not just to class him morally with the pickpockets who infested Drury Lane Theatre, or the highwaymen who stopped coaches on Blackheath.'—Macaulay, vol. iii. p. 47.

to

to 900 kine, besides ponies, sheep, and goats, at the time of the massacre, which was preceded by a guarded truce of nearly eight months, during which, at all events, they and their cattle must have lived on what the valley could supply. On the 22nd August, 1691, Colonel Hill reports from Fort William to Lord Raith: 'This acquaints your Lordship that we are still in the same peaceable condition that we have been for more than a year past.' Yet Lord Macaulay insists on assimilating Glencoe to a mountain gorge in Calabria or the Apennines:—

'In the Gaelic tongue, Glencoe signifies the Glen of Weeping:* and in truth that pass is the most dreary and melancholy of all the Scottish passes, the very Valley of the Shadow of Death . . . . Mile after mile the traveller looks in vain for the smoke of one hut, or for one human form wrapped in a plaid, and listens in vain for the bark of a shepherd's dog, or the bleat of a lamb. Mile after mile the only sound that indicates life is the faint cry of a bird of prey from some storm-beaten pinnacle of rock. The progress of civilisation, which has turned so many wastes into fields yellow with harvests, or gay with apple-blossoms, has only made Glencoe more desolate. All the science and industry of a peaceful age can extract nothing valuable from that wilderness; but, in an age of violence and rapine, the wilderness itself was valued on account of the shelter which it afforded to the plunderer and his plunder.'—(Vol. iii. p. 513.)

There it is! what the author of the 'Memoirs of Lochiel' calls 'a beautiful valley where the inhabitants reside;' what Mrs. Grant of Laggan describes as 'a glen so narrow, so warm, so fertile—the haunt of roes and numberless small birds, always accounted (for its narrow bounds) *a place of great plenty and security*,' is turned into a barren wilderness, the appropriate haunt of a gang of banditti, whom it was quite right to exterminate by the readiest method that came to hand.

The tragedy was perpetrated under the authority of Instructions from the King to Sir Thomas Livingstone, commandant of the forces, dated 16th January, 1692. After providing for the treatment of Glengarry and others, this document concludes:—

'If Mac Ean of Glencoe and that trybe can be well separated from the rest, it will be a proper vindication of the public justice to extirpate that den of thieves. The double of these instructions is only communicated to Colonel Hill.

'W. Rex.'

These Instructions were forwarded by the Master of Stair, Secretary of State for Scotland, to Sir Thomas Livingstone and

* According to Sir John Sinclair, it signifies the valley of the Conn or Cona.—'Stat. Account of Scotland,' vol. i. p. 485.

Colonel

Colonel Hill. In his letter to Colonel Hill, he employs the exact equivalent to the word *extirpate* in the instructions: 'I shall entreat you that for a just vengeance and public example the thieving tribe of Glencoe may be *rooted out* to purpose.' * * 'It must be quickly done, otherwise they will make shift both for the men and the cattle.' The manner in which the order was carried out is faithfully narrated in the history. On the 1st February, a hundred and twenty soldiers of Argyle's regiment, commanded by Captain Campbell of Glenlyon, marched to Glencoe. They announced that they came as friends, and were kindly received.

'Provisions were liberally supplied. There was no want of beef, *which had probably fattened in distant pastures;** nor was any payment demanded, for in hospitality, as in thievery, the Gaelic marauders rivalled the Bedouins. During twelve days the soldiers lived familiarly with the people of the glen. Old Mac Ian, who had before felt many misgivings as to the relation in which he stood to the Government, seems to have been pleased with the visit. The officers passed much of their time with him and his family. The long evenings were cheerfully spent by the peat-fire, with the help of some packs of cards which had found their way to that remote corner of the world, and of some French brandy which was probably part of James's farewell gift to his Highland supporters.'—(Vol. iii. pp. 526, 527.)

Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton, second in command to Hill, who had scruples and did not act in person, had fixed five o'clock in the morning for the deed, hoping that before that time he should reach Glencoe with four hundred men, and 'have stopped all the holes in which the old fox and his two cubs (Mac Ian and his sons) could take refuge.' But at five precisely, whether he had arrived or not, 'Glenlyon was to fall on, and to slay every Macdonald under seventy:'—

'Meanwhile Lindsay had knocked at the door of the old Chief and had asked for admission in friendly language. The door was opened. Mac Ian, while putting on his clothes and calling to his servants to bring some refreshment for his visitors, was shot through the head. Two of his attendants were slain with him. His wife was already up and dressed in such finery as the princesses of the rude Highland glens were accustomed to wear. The assassins pulled off her clothes and trinkets. The rings were not easily taken from her fingers; but a soldier tore them away with his teeth. She died on the following day.

* * * * *

'It was broad day long before Hamilton arrived. He found the work not even half performed. *About thirty corpses lay wallowing*

* The clan, as Lord Macaulay knew, had been quiet and confined to their glen for nearly a year.

in

in blood on the dunghills before the doors. One or two women were seen among the number, and yet a more fearful and piteous sight, a little hand, which had been lopped in the tumult of the butchery from some infant. . . . The deserted hamlets were then set on fire; and the troops departed, driving away with them many sheep and goats, nine hundred kine, and two hundred of the small shaggy ponies of the Highlands.'—(Vol. iii. pp. 528, 529.)

Their cattle and ponies were never returned or accounted for, and not one syllable of disapproval does this wholesale robbery (which Stair's letter shows to have been meditated) call forth from the historian, who is not prevented by feeling or taste from depreciating the confiding hospitality of the destined victims by a sneer at the abundance of their beef and the source from which their brandy may have been supplied. 'It is probable,' he admits, 'that those who perished by cold, weariness, and want were not less numerous than those who were slain by the assassins.' It is probable that in such a season, and with no place of refuge but the hills, those who so perished were far more numerous and their sufferings far greater.

Such, in its broad outline, is the transaction for which Lord Macaulay maintains the great and good King William to have been in no point of view blamable or responsible. When he signed the Instructions he did not know what he was signing; and if he did know what he was signing, might he not have heard with what energy James V. had put down the moss-troopers of the border, 'how John Armstrong and his thirty-six horsemen, when they came forth to welcome their sovereign, had scarcely been allowed time to say a single prayer before they were all tied up and turned off?' Or was there not the venerable example of a successor of St. Peter?

'The eulogists of that great pontiff [Sixtus V.], tell us that there was one formidable gang which could not be dislodged from a stronghold among the Apennines. Beasts of burden were therefore loaded with poisoned food and wine, and sent by a road which ran close to the fastness. The robbers sallied forth, seized the prey, feasted and died; and the pious old pope exulted greatly when he heard that the corpses of thirty ruffians, who had been the terror of many peaceful villages, had been found lying among the mules and packages.'—(Vol. iii. p. 521.)

Are we to complete the parallel? Did the great and good King William exult greatly when he heard that thirty corpses (the number is identical) lay wallowing in blood on the dunghills before the doors in Glencoe? If the king had forgotten or never heard of precedents so exactly in point, they must have been familiar to the politic and cultivated mind of the

Master of Stair; and it is on him that Lord Macaulay fastens the entire responsibility of the Instructions, although at a loss to suggest an adequate motive, except on the hypothesis that he projected a system of policy for the Highlands similar to that which Cromwell ruthlessly carried out in Ireland. But one does not see what this far-sighted statesman could hope to effect by the massacre of a single clan; and there is ample evidence in his letters that he would have preferred settling the Highlands by the 'easiest means and at leisure'—these are his words—as also that he was in constant communication with the King touching the required steps for quieting them. On the 9th January, a week before the signing of the Instructions, he writes to Livingstone: 'We have an account that Lockart and Macnaughten, Appin and Glencoe, took the benefit of the indemnity at Inverary. . . . I have been with the King; he says your Instructions shall be despatched on Monday.' This proves not merely that the King had duly considered the Instructions, but that he was aware of the precise position of Mac Ian in having virtually, if not technically, entitled himself to the benefit of the indemnity. There is ample documentary evidence to the same effect, and all that can be produced against it is the inference drawn by Burnet, writing thirteen years after the event, that 'the King signed this (the Instructions) without any inquiry about it, for he was too apt to sign papers in a hurry, without examining the importance of them.' *

'But,' argues Lord Macaulay, 'even on the supposition that he read the order to which he affixed his name, there seems to be no reason for blaming him . . . The words naturally bear a sense perfectly innocent, and would, but for the horrible event which followed, have been universally understood in that sense. It is undoubtedly one of the first duties of every government to extirpate gangs of *thieves*.' He employs an equivocal and (by his own showing) inapplicable term, and then argues from it as a fact, a not unusual device of this accomplished rhetorician—

'This does not mean that every thief ought to be treacherously assassinated in his sleep, *or even that every thief ought to be put to death after a fair trial*, but that every gang, as a gang, ought to be completely broken up, and that whatever severity is indispensably necessary for that end ought to be used. It is in this sense that we praise

* Burnet's 'History of his own Times,' book 5th, of which the first sentence is: 'I now begin on the first day of May, 1705, to prosecute this work.' His recollection of the affair was vague, for he describes the Instructions as simply directing that 'some examples should be made of them (the Glencoe clan).' He states that the Instructions were signed and countersigned by the king.

the

the Marquess of Hastings for extirpating the Pindarees, and Lord William Bentinck for extirpating the Thugs.'—(Vol. iii. p. 524.)

This would be all very well if a civil magistrate, supported by an armed force, had been duly instructed to break up a gang; if even a Bloody Assize had been held by a Scotch Jeffreys in Glencoe. But when we are told this does not mean 'even that every thief ought to be put to death after a fair trial,' we reply that it unfortunately does not. It means that there shall be no trial, fair or unfair, no attempt to separate the innocent from the guilty, or to distinguish between degrees of guilt. It means that the summary proceeding by which the Duc de Malakoff extirpated an Arab tribe, namely, by stifling in a cave, would have been equally applicable to a civilised community. If extirpation by an armed force meant anything, it meant that military execution should be done on the entire clan; and no one knew better than King William how such instructions were likely to be interpreted by soldiers. If they had been procured by false pretences, or by an abuse of confidence, if they had been exceeded in any way, if a false gloss had been put on them or an unexpected use made of them, by Breadalbane, Stair, Livingstone, Hill, Hamilton, or Glenlyon—how happens it that not one of these, not a superior or subordinate, was punished or rebuked?* On the contrary, most of those concerned were rewarded, and when the execration of all Europe threatened a day of retribution, a Scroll of Discharge was given to Stair, who, according to Lord Macaulay, had neither fear nor remorse. 'He was indeed mortified, but he was mortified only by the blunders of Hamilton, and by the escape of so many of the damnable breed.' When all the details of the massacre had become notorious, Stair wrote: 'The only thing I regret is that any got away.' There was one of the actors whose conscience was tenderer, or his nerves weaker. Leslie, the author of 'Gallienus Redivivus,' writes in June, 1692: 'Glencoe hangs about Glenlyon night and day; you may see *him* in his face.' This Lord Macaulay converts into, 'Glencoe was ever before him,' leaving it doubtful whether he was haunted by the man or the place. Glenlyon was made a Colonel, and Stair an Earl.

The acquittal of King William from all the consequences, direct and indirect, regular or irregular, of what was a lamentable act of negligence and a condonation of gross misconduct on the part of his advisers and servants at the best, contrasts strikingly

* 'Indeed the not punishing this (the massacre) with a due rigour was the greatest blot in his whole reign, and had a very ill effect in alienating that nation from the king and government.'—(Burnet.)

with the attempt to fix on the hero of Blenheim the entire responsibility of the disastrous failure at Brest in June, 1692. The expedition was planned as a surprise. The fleet was under the command of Berkeley, and the land forces of Talmash. On arriving before the place they had ample warning that their design had been discovered. Lord Carmarthen, who led the advanced squadron of ships, caught sight of large bodies of foot and horse collected to oppose the landing.

'The young Rear-Admiral sent an officer in all haste to warn Talmash. But Talmash was so completely possessed by the notion that the French were not prepared to repel an attack that he disregarded all cautions, and would not even trust his own eyes. He felt sure that the force which he saw assembled on the shore was a mere rabble of peasants, who had been brought together in haste from the surrounding country. Confident that these mock soldiers would run like sheep before real soldiers, he ordered his men to pull for the land. He was soon undeceived. A terrible fire mowed down his troops faster than they could get on shore. He had himself scarcely sprung on dry ground when he received a wound in the thigh from a cannon-ball, and was carried back to his skiff. His men reembarked in confusion. Ships and boats made haste to get out of the bay, but did not succeed till 400 sailors, and 700 soldiers had fallen. During many days the waves continued to throw up pierced and shattered corpses on the beach of Britanny. The battery from which Talmash received his wound is called, to this day, the Englishman's Death.

* * * * * * *

'The armament returned to Portsmouth. There Talmash died, exclaiming with his last breath that he had been lured into a snare by treachery. The public grief and indignation were loudly expressed. . . . . The real criminal was not named; nor, till the archives of the House of Stuart were explored, was it known to the public that Talmash had perished by *the basest of all the hundred villanies* of Marlborough.'—(Vol. iv. pp. 101, 102.)

The precise motive for this crowning villany is assumed and stated with the same confidence as the crime and its consequences:—

'Yet never had Marlborough been less a Jacobite than at the moment when he rendered this wicked and shameful service to the Jacobite cause. It may be confidently affirmed that to serve the banished family was not his object, and that to ingratiate himself with the banished family was only his secondary object. His primary object was to force himself into the service of the existing Government, and to regain possession of those important and lucrative places from which he had been dismissed more than two years before. He knew that the country and the Parliament would not patiently bear to see the English army commanded by foreign generals. Two Englishmen only had shown themselves fit for high military posts, himself

himself and Talmash. If Talmash were defeated and disgraced, William would scarcely have a choice.'—(Vol. iv. p. 102.)

Such is the charge, distinctly and impressively urged, against the illustrious commander in whose fair fame most Englishmen feel a patriotic, almost a personal, interest. They will consequently be glad to learn that it can be satisfactorily disproved by documentary evidence in the possession of the historian when he wrote: on the strength of which it may be confidently affirmed that, to ingratiate himself with the banished family was Marlborough's sole object, and that he knew his intelligence to be useless for all practical purposes when he forwarded it. Treachery was rife in high places so long as a change of dynasty was on the cards; and, being out of office, he was not in a condition to betray the secrets of the council-board. He was clearly anticipated by Godolphin, then First Lord of the Treasury, if not by other members of the government; for, so early as the 22nd April, the forces which repulsed the attack had been concentrated at Brest, and Vauban was then actively engaged in adding to the fortifications. The letter of Marlborough to James was despatched on the 4th of May, and could not have reached Louis for many days afterwards. The expeditionary force left England on the 5th of May, and ought to have reached its destination long before the letter. The attack was delayed till the 7th or 8th of June; and on the 18th, after the failure, William wrote to Shrewsbury:

'I own to you that I did not suppose they would have made the attempt without having well reconnoitred the situation of the enemy to receive them; since they were long apprised of our intended attack, and made active preparations for defence; for what was practicable *two months ago* was no longer so at present.'

'It is certain,' says Oldmixon, 'that he (Talmash) believed himself betrayed. He knew who were the traitors, and named them to a person who stood at his bedside, that he might discover them to Queen Mary in his Majesty's absence, that she might be upon her guard against those *pernicious counsellors who had retarded the descent*, and by that means given France time so to fortify Brest as to render all approaches to it impracticable.' This could not point to Marlborough; and Lord Macaulay, after mentioning that there were 'many amongst the noble and powerful' whose object was to be safe in every event, 'who openly took the oath of allegiance to one King, and secretly plighted their word to the other, adds, 'Among those who were guilty of this wickedness three men stood pre-eminent—Russell, Godolphin, and Marlborough.' There is specific proof that James's

James's emissary (Floyd) got intelligence of the expedition from Godolphin, and that Floyd's report reached Louis through Melfort on the 1st of May, three days before the date of Marlborough's letter.* Why, then, is the whole ignominy of the betrayal fixed on Marlborough? His guilt was undeniable, but that is no reason for exaggerating it so extravagantly. It was one thing to do what half the public men of the time were doing, and another to sacrifice the lives of hundreds of brave men for the basest of selfish purposes. We suspect that Marlborough is made to bear the brunt, because pointed paragraphs are telling in proportion to the grandeur and splendour of the object to be brought down. The most languid public must be startled to hear a hundred villanies imputed in a breath to one whom all succeeding generations of his countrymen have delighted to honour; and a morbid excitement may be kept up by the revival of forgotten calumnies. Marlborough's love of money was well known. It was an admitted weakness, but it did not prevent him from doing many generous actions; and the manner in which Lord Macaulay has made it the source of habitual baseness in every relation of life is preposterous:—

'All the precious gifts which nature had lavished on him he valued chiefly for what they would fetch. At twenty he made money of his beauty and his vigour. At sixty he made money of his genius and his glory. The applauses which were justly due to his conduct at Walcourt could not altogether drown the voices of those who muttered that wherever a broad piece was to be saved or got, this hero was a mere Euclio,† a mere Harpagon; that though he drew a large allowance under pretence of keeping a public table, he never asked an officer to dinner; that his muster-rolls were fraudulently made up; that he pocketed pay in the names of men who had long been dead, of men who had been killed in his own sight four years before at Sedgemoor; that there were twenty such names in one troop; that there were thirty-six in another.'—(Vol. iii. p. 148.)

The day after his first interview with Lady Bellaston, Tom Jones gave Partridge a fifty-pound note to change. The day after an interview with the Duchess of Cleveland, Churchill produced five thousand pounds, which Lord Macaulay says he forthwith invested in an annuity. This is what is meant by making money of his beauty; yet it seems hard to stigmatise a young officer in the Guards, in the midst of social corruption, for

* This is clear from the same Stuart archives on which Lord Macaulay founds the charge. See Macpherson's 'Original Papers,' &c., and the authorities collected in 'The New Examen.'

† Euclio, in 1689, was only known through Plautus. He was not popularised by Pope till the reign of George II.

conduct

conduct which was not thought dishonourable in a hero of romance. Did he make money of his beauty when, at twenty-eight, he married a penniless girl for love, and remained faithful to her through life?* He no more made money of his genius and glory at sixty than Pitt when he accepted the Cinque Ports, or than the Duke of Wellington when he received his parliamentary grants and Stratfieldsaye. Marlborough repeatedly refused the government of the Netherlands with 60,000*l.* a year.

The sole authority, and a precious one it is, for the charge of pocketing pay in the names of men who had long been dead, 'of men who had been killed in his own sight at Sedgemoor' (a battle fought in the dark), is thus cited in a note:—

'See the "Dear Bargain," a Jacobite pamphlet, clandestinely printed in 1690. "I have not patience," says the writer, "after this wretch (Marlborough) to mention any other. All are innocent comparatively, even Kirke himself."'—(Vol. iii. p. 148.)

The 'Dear Bargain' is a scurrilous party pamphlet in which an equally startling accusation is brought against William, which consequently Lord Macaulay is estopped from denying, nay, which he would be bound in honour and consistency to adopt. William is accused of sending his English soldiers to die of starvation and disease in Holland, 'where you might see them sprawling by parcels, and groaning under the double gripes of their bowels and their consciences.' Mary is 'an ungrateful Tullia, scandalising Christianity and driving her beasts over the face of her dead father.' In short, this 'Dear Bargain' was certainly one of the pamphlets which Lord Macaulay had in view, when, wishing to exculpate William from the charge of leaving so long unnoticed the atrocities perpetrated at Glencoe, he writes:—

'We can hardly suppose that he was much in the habit of reading Jacobite pamphlets; and, if he did read them, he would have found in them such a quantity of absurd and rancorous invective against himself that he would have been very little inclined to credit any imputation which they might throw on his servants. He would have seen himself accused, in one tract, of being a concealed Papist, in another of having poisoned Jeffreys in the Tower, in a third of having contrived to have Talmash taken off at Brest. He would have seen it asserted that, in Ireland, he once ordered fifty of his wounded English soldiers to be burned alive. He would have seen that the unalterable affection which he felt from his boyhood to his death for three or four of the bravest and most trusty friends that ever prince

* 'Sarah was poor; *and a plain girl with a large fortune was proposed to him.* His love, after a struggle, prevailed over his avarice: marriage only strengthened his passion.'—(Macaulay.)

had

had the happiness to possess, was made a ground for imputing to him abominations as foul as those which are buried under the waters of the Dead Sea. He might naturally be slow to believe frightful imputations thrown by writers whom he knew to be habitual liars, on a statesman whose abilities he valued highly, and to whose exertions he had, on some great occasions, owed much.'—(Vol. iv. p. 154.)

Ought not the historian to be equally slow in believing frightful imputations thrown by these habitual liars on a statesman and general whose abilities he dared not depreciate, and whose glory he has vainly laboured to obscure? All that can be said is, that, if he had refrained from drawing upon such sources, many a fine piece of rhetorical composition would have been ruinously sobered down or lost.

The startling episode of the Christian carrier, which has called forth tears from sensitive readers of both sexes, would have been similarly impaired by a slight infusion of accuracy.

'John Brown, a poor carrier of Lanarkshire, was, for his singular piety, commonly called the Christian carrier. Many years later, when Scotland enjoyed rest, prosperity, and religious freedom, old men who remembered the evil days described him as one versed in divine things, blameless in life, and so peaceable that the tyrants could find no offence in him, except that he absented himself from the public worship of the Episcopalians. On the 1st of May he was cutting turf, when he was seized by Claverhouse's dragoons, rapidly examined, convicted of nonconformity, and sentenced to death. It is said that, even among the soldiers, it was not easy to find an executioner. For the wife of the poor man was present; she led one little child by the hand; it was easy to see that she was about to give birth to another; and even those wild and hard-hearted men, who nicknamed one another Beelzebub and Apollyon, shrank from the great wickedness of butchering her husband before her face. The prisoner, meanwhile, raised above himself by the near prospect of eternity, prayed loud and fervently as one inspired, till *Claverhouse, in a fury, shot him dead.* It was reported by credible witnesses that the widow cried out in her agony, "Well, sir, well; the day of reckoning will come;" and that the murderer replied, "To man I can answer for what I have done; and as for God, I will take Him into mine own hand." Yet it was rumoured that even on his seared conscience and adamantine heart the dying ejaculations of his victim made an impression which was never effaced.'—(Vol. i. p. 388.)

This is a dramatised and highly-coloured version of the story told by Wodrow, the most prejudiced narrator of the wrongs of his co-religionists whom it was possible to pick out. He is contradicted on the main point by two writers of his own party and creed, one of whom, Walker, says: '*Claverhouse ordered six soldiers to shoot him.* The most part of the bullets came upon his

his head, which scattered his brains upon the ground.' The most decisive document, however, is the original report from Claverhouse to the Duke of Queensberry, the head of the Scotch Government, dated 3rd May, 1685, two days after the event:—

'May it please your Grace,

'On Friday last, among the hills betwixt Douglas and the Ploughlands, we pursued two fellows a great way through the mosses, and in the end seized them. They had no arms about them, and denied they had any. But being asked if they would take the abjuration, the eldest of the two, called John Brown, refused it; nor would he swear not to rise in arms against the King, but said he knew no king. Upon which, and there being found bullets and match in his house, and treasonable papers, I caused shoot him dead, which he suffered very unconcernedly.'

The other, the nephew of John Brown, offered to take the oath, and was promised his life if he would make an ingenuous confession:—

'Upon which he confessed that he was at that attack of Newmills, and that he had come straight to this house of his uncle's on Sunday morning. In the time he was making this confession the soldiers found out a house in the hill, under ground, that could hold a dozen of men, and there were swords and pistols in it; and this fellow declared that they belonged to his uncle, and that he had lurked in that place ever since Bothwell, where he was in arms.'

Lord Macaulay could not have been aware of this despatch; but he might have ascertained John Brown's real character either from Wodrow's appendix, where he figures in a list of proclaimed rebels in arms, or from the cautionary remark of Sir Walter Scott: 'While we read this dismal story, we must remember Brown's situation was that of an avowed and determined rebel, liable as such to military execution.'

The readiness of the Macaulay school to swear by the words of the master was never more loyally displayed than in their encouraging him to abide by the most heinous of his charges against William Penn after it had completely broken down. The facts are now so well known that the briefest recapitulation of them will suffice. Monmouth was met, on entering Taunton, by a procession of school-girls, headed by their schoolmistress:—

'The Queen's maids of honour asked the royal permission to wring money out of the parents of the poor children; and the permission was granted. An order was sent down to Taunton that all these little girls should be seized and imprisoned. Sir Francis Warre of Hestercombe, the Tory member for Bridgewater, was requested to undertake the office of exacting the ransom. . . . Warre excused himself from taking any part in a transaction so scandalous. The maids of honour then requested

requested William Penn to act for them: and Penn *accepted* the [illegible]

There is not a title of evidence that any Penn, or Penne, accepted the commission or was engaged in the transaction. Oldmixon states that the agent of the Maids of Honour was 'Penn, the Popish lawyer, who had an under-agent, one Crane of Bridgewater.' Ralph says that the Maids sent down an agent whom he does not name. All the contemporary writers (including Burnet, who disliked Penn) are silent about Penn, which they certainly would not have been if so notable a person had been engaged. But there was a George Penne, a regular pardon-monger, the very description of a person whom we should expect to be employed; and to him the letter on which the whole question hangs was obviously addressed:—

'Mr. Penne. 'Whitehall, Feb. 13, 1685-6.

'Her Majesty's Maids of Honour having acquainted me that they *designe* to employ you and Mr. Walden in making a composition with the Relations of the Maids of Taunton for the high Misdemeanour they have been guilty of, I do at their request hereby let you know that His Majesty has been pleased to give their Fines to the said Maids of Honour, and therefore recommend it to Mr. Walden and you to make the most advantageous composition you can in their behalfe.

'I am, Sir, your humble servant,

'SUNDERLAND.'

A copy of this letter was first discovered in the State-Paper Office by Sir James Mackintosh, who (never having heard of George Penne) cites it and argues from it as 'Letter to William Penn.' Lord Macaulay followed Mackintosh; but instead of doing what we feel convinced Mackintosh would have done when fully acquainted with the circumstances, he refuses to acknowledge his error; and in the utter absence of any description of proof, he boldly re-asserts, in the last corrected edition of his History, that all presumption and probability require 'Mr. Penne' to be read 'Mr. William Penn.' A deputation from the highly respectable community of Quakers, who felt a stain on the honour of their founder like a wound, had a formal interview with the historian, at his chambers in the Albany, in the presence of (we believe) Lord Lansdowne, the Dean of St. Paul's (Dr. Milman), and Mr. Charles Austin. The particulars of the conference have not been made public. The result may be collected from a note to the latest edition of his History corrected by himself. He says:—

'If I thought that I had committed an error, I should, I hope, have

have the honesty to acknowledge it. But, after full consideration, I am satisfied that Sunderland's letter was addressed to William Penn.'

He contends that the spelling of the name proves nothing. It may not prove much, although William Penn and his father invariably spelt the name Penn; and although it was so spelt by persons about the Court (including Sunderland), as well as in the very same books in the State Paper and Privy Council Offices in which the name of George Penne (*sic*) occurs. But we fail to see the point of this sarcastic retort:—

'I am quite confident that, if the letter which we are considering had been of a different kind, if Mr. Penne had been informed that, in consequence of his earnest intercession, the King had been graciously pleased to grant a free pardon to the Taunton girls, and if I had attempted to deprive the Quaker of the credit of that intercession on the ground that his name was not Penne, the very persons who now complain so bitterly that I am unjust to his memory would have complained quite as bitterly, and, I must say, with much more reason.'—(Vol. i. p. 510.)

This is strange logic. In the given contingency, the doubt would not have arisen. Whichever Penn, or Penne, had been informed that his intercession had prevailed, would have been confessedly the man. William Penn's position at the time is thus described in the 'History':—

'Between James and Penn there had long been a familiar acquaintance. The Quaker now became a courtier and almost a favourite. He was every day summoned from the gallery into the closet, and sometimes had long audiences while peers were kept waiting in the antechambers. It was noised abroad that he had more real power to help and hurt than many nobles who filled high offices. He was soon surrounded by flatterers and suppliants. His house at Kensington was sometimes thronged, at his hour of rising, by more than two hundred suitors.'—(Vol. i. p. 394.)

Taunton is 164 miles from London; the journey there and back would alone have occupied a week. Penn's prolonged absence on such an errand could hardly have remained unnoticed by the king, the peers, or the two hundred suitors. It was a job entirely out of his way; yet Lord Macaulay, after contrasting the low position of George Penne (nothing is known of Walden), asks, with an air of conviction and triumph: 'Which of them, then, was the more likely to be employed in the matter to which Sunderland's letter related? Was it George or William, an agent of the lowest or of the highest class?' Every reader can best answer this question for himself. 'It is clear,' he adds, 'that the Maids of Honour were desirous to have an agent of high station and character.' It is clear that they failed in getting one;

one; and as they were obliged to put up with Brent and Crane, it is equally clear that even the 'designe to employ' Mr. Penne and Mr. Walden went no farther than design. If William Penn had been intended, he would be no more compromised by the bare intention to appoint him than Sir Francis Warre. Lord Macaulay takes for granted throughout that the entire question turns on the name: he neither withdraws nor justifies his statement that Penn accepted the commission.*

Lord Macaulay's love of dramatic effect seemed to render him incapable of giving the exact words of a speaker, even when he quotes them with inverted commas. In the following examples, as Mr. Paget remarks, 'the actual meaning may not be much altered, but it is not Glengarry, Carmarthen, or Spratt that speaks, but Lord Macaulay; and a slight change of phraseology converts a dignified remonstrance into a brutal insult, and a pious exhortation into something very like a vulgar oath, and that, too, put into the mouth of a bishop.'†

'Original.	'Lord Macaulay.
'When it was objected that he [*i.e.* Glengarry] would not be able to make it good, since his followers were not near equal to Locheil's in numbers, he answered that the courage of his men would make up that defect.' —'Mem. of Locheil,' 254.	'When he was reminded that Locheil's followers were in number nearly double of the Glengarry men—"No matter," *he cried*, "one M'Donald is worth two Camerons." '—Macaulay, iii. 73.
'The Lords replied, "Nay, we all well remember you particularly mentioned the flower-pots."—'Spratt's Narrative,' 70.	'*Then the whole board broke forth*, "How *dare* you say so? We all remember it." '—*Ibid.*, iii. 560.
'Lord President.—"Young, thou art the strangest creature that ever I did hear of. Dost thou think we could imagine that the Bishop of Rochester would combine," &c.—*Ibid.*, 71.	'"*Man!*" *cried Carmarthen*, "wouldst thou have us believe that the bishop combined," ' &c.—*Ibid.*, iii. 561.
'I left him praying God to give him grace to repent; and only adding that else he was more in danger of his own damnation than I of his accusation in Parliament.'—*Ibid.*, second part, p. 3.	'"God give you repentance," *answered the bishop*: "for, depend upon it, you are in much more danger of being *damned*, than I of being impeached." '—*Ibid.*, iii. 561.

* The groundlessness or exaggeration of Lord Macaulay's other charges against Penn are fully exposed in 'The New Examen,' and in 'William Penn: an Historical Biography,' by Mr. Hepworth Dixon.

† 'The New Examen,' p. 226.

Similar

Similar instances might be quoted to almost any extent; but the way in which the historian has dressed up the maiden speech of Lord Ashley (the grandson of Achitophel) in support of the bill allowing persons accused of high treason to be defended by counsel, is too striking to be omitted :—

'In the course of his speech he faltered, stammered, and seemed to lose the thread of his reasoning. The House, then, as now, indulgent to novices, and then, as now, well aware that on a first appearance the hesitation which is the effect of modesty and sensibility is quite as promising a sign as volubility of utterance and ease of manner, encouraged him to proceed. "How can I, Sir," said the young orator, recovering himself, "produce a stronger argument in favour of this Bill than my own failure? My fortune, my character, my life, are not at stake. I am speaking to an audience whose kindness might well inspire me with courage. And yet, from mere nervousness, from mere want of practice in addressing large assemblies, I have lost my recollection: I am unable to go on with my argument. How helpless, then, must be a poor man who, never having opened his lips in public, is called upon to reply, without a moment's preparation, to the ablest and most experienced advocates in the kingdom, and whose faculties are paralysed by the thought that, if he fails to convince his hearers, he will in a few hours die on a gallows, and leave beggary and infamy to those who are dearest to him!"—(Vol. iv. p. 203.)

Compare this version, for which no authority is given, with the best authenticated account in Cobbett's 'Parliamentary History':—

'The House, after giving him a little time to recover his confusion, called loudly upon him to go on, when he proceeded to this effect: "If, Sir (addressing himself to the Speaker), I, who rise only to give my opinion on the Bill now depending, am so confounded that I am unable to express the least of what I proposed to say, what must the condition of that man be, who, without any assistance, is pleading for his life, and under apprehension of being deprived of it?"'

Whether Ashley really lost his presence of mind or only pretended to lose it, the speech he made on recovering himself must have been effective in exact proportion to its simplicity. It is spoilt by amplification.

The critics of the Macaulay school especially rely upon 'that power of divination which he derived from his astonishing memory for details, and intuitive perception of their bearing on general views.' They would fain endow him with the logical instinct of a Cuvier or an Owen, who from a single joint or bone of an antediluvian monster, can arrive unerringly at the size, structure and habits of the reptile. But this is an inborn and original

original faculty, which cannot be acquired or even much improved by reading: and the details with which Lord Macaulay's astonishing memory was crowded were almost exclusively drawn from books or manuscripts. He was not a patient observer or profound thinker; he could not tolerate suspense; and the proof that he had not the intuitive perception claimed for him, is that in matters of controversy in which he has shown the greatest confidence, whenever new materials have subsequently turned up—these new materials have almost always proved fatal to his argument. Claverhouse's report of the execution of the Christian carrier is one instance. Two others have been brought out prominently since his lamented death by the publication of the Autobiography of Mrs. Piozzi, and the Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis: the first bearing on his Biography of Johnson; the second on his theory of the authorship of Junius, which a large section of the Whig party at once incorporated into their creed.

The following splendid passage—*splendide mendax* as Mr. Goldwin Smith called it—is taken from the Biography of Johnson, and as we purpose to disprove every individual sentence of it as well as the general tenor, we quote it entire:

'Johnson was now in his seventy-second year. The infirmities of age were coming fast upon him. . . . The kind and generous Thrale was no more; and it would have been well if his wife had been laid beside him. But she survived to be the laughing-stock of those who had envied her, and to draw from the eyes of the old man who had loved her beyond anything in the world, tears far more bitter than he would have shed over her grave. . . .

'She soon fell in love with a music-master from Brescia, in whom nobody but herself could discover anything to admire. Her pride, and perhaps some better feelings, struggled hard against this degrading passion. But the struggle irritated her nerves, soured her temper, and at length endangered her health. Conscious that her choice was one which Johnson could not approve, she became desirous to escape from his inspection. Her manner towards him changed. She was sometimes cold and sometimes petulant. She did not conceal her joy when he left Streatham: she never pressed him to return; and, if he came unbidden, she received him in a manner which convinced him that he was no longer a welcome guest. He took the very intelligible hints which she gave. He read, for the last time, a chapter of the Greek Testament in the library which had been formed by himself. In a solemn and tender prayer he commended the house and its inmates to the Divine protection, and, with emotions which choked his voice and convulsed his powerful frame, left for ever that beloved home for the gloomy and desolate house behind Fleet Street, where the few and evil days which still remained to him were to run out.

'Here, in June, 1783, he had a paralytic stroke, from which, however,

however, he recovered, and which does not appear to have at all impaired his intellectual faculties. But other maladies came thick upon him. His asthma tormented him day and night. Dropsical symptoms made their appearance. While sinking under a complication of diseases, he heard that the woman whose friendship had been the chief happiness of sixteen years of his life, had married an Italian fiddler; that all London was crying shame upon her; and that the newspapers and magazines were filled with allusions to the Ephesian matron and the two pictures in Hamlet. He vehemently said that he would try to forget her existence. He never uttered her name. Every memorial of her which met his eye he flung into the fire. She meanwhile fled from the laughter and hisses of her countrymen and countrywomen to a land where she was unknown, hastened across Mount Cenis, and learned, while passing a merry Christmas of concerts and lemonade parties at Milan, that the great man with whose name hers is inseparably associated, had ceased to exist.'—(Vol. vii. p. 354.)

Thrale died on the 4th April, 1781; Johnson on the 13th December, 1784. The time included in Lord Macaulay's summary is nearly three years and three-quarters, during the whole of which we are asked to believe that Johnson's life was made miserable by the widow of his lost friend. He was one of the executors; he took a ludicrous pride in the discharge of his duty; he was constantly fussifying about the brewery with an inkhorn in his button-hole; and was always to be found either at the house in the Borough, or at Streatham, till the concern and premises were sold, much to his regret, in June, 1781. He was subsequently as much at Streatham as ever till she quitted it; and it is clear, from the letters, that he made himself as much at home and thought himself as welcome as before. On March 20, 1782, he writes to Mrs. Gastrell and Mrs. Aston: 'When Dr. Falconer saw me, I was at home only by accident, for I lived much with Mrs. Thrale, and had all the care from her that she could take or could be taken.' On the 24th August, 1782, to Boswell: 'I have no call; but if you desire to meet me at Ashbourne, I believe I can come thither; if you had rather come to London, I can stay at Streatham: take your choice.' Two days before she had made up her mind to let Streatham, being no longer able to keep it up. On August 22nd, 1782, she writes:—

'Mr. Johnson thought well of the project, and wished me to put it in early execution; seemed less concerned in parting with me than I wished him. . . . See the importance of a person to himself. I fancied Mr. Johnson could not have existed without me forsooth, as we have now lived together for above eighteen years. I have so fondled him in sickness and in health. Not a bit of it. He feels nothing in parting with me, nothing in the least; but thinks it a prudent scheme, and

and goes to his books as usual. This is philosophy and truth; he always said he hated a *feeler.*'

We can easily understand that he felt more than he chose to express at such a disturbance of his habits, at his advanced age, as was involved in the separation from Streatham; but this, he well knew, she could not help, and she acted by his advice throughout. Lord Macaulay was not bound to know what is now known from her journals; but it required no power of divination or astonishing memory to collect from the printed letters before him the precise state of the relations between the parties. Nay, if he had only read attentively the notes to that very edition of Boswell * which he assailed with undue and unbecoming acrimony, he would have been spared the finishing touch about 'leaving for ever that beloved home for the gloomy and desolate house behind Fleet Street;' which, when the varnish is washed off, is an apt example of the maxim that there is only one step from the sublime (or the pathetic) to the ridiculous. In one note Mr. Croker justly remarks, that 'Johnson offered up a regretful prayer on leaving a place where he had enjoyed so many comforts, not because Mrs. Thrale made him less welcome there, but because she, and he with her, were leaving it;' in another, that he seems to have taken leave of the kitchen as well as of the church at Streatham in Latin, which is translated thus:

'Oct. 6th, Sunday, 1782.

'I dined at Streatham on boiled leg of lamb, with spinach, the stuffing of flour and raisins, round of beef, and turkey poult; and after the meat service, figs, grapes, not yet ripe in consequence of the bad season, with peaches, also hard. I took my place at table in no joyful mood, and partook of the food moderately, lest I should finish by intemperance. If I rightly remember, the banquet at the funeral of Hadon came into my mind. When shall I revisit Streatham?'

It must be admitted that the exclamation—'When shall I revisit Streatham?' loses much of its pathos when connected with these culinary details, with the unripe grapes, the hard peaches, and the philosophic or moral dread of finishing by intemperance. The next morning, Oct. 7th, he took his place in the coach

* 'Boswell's Life of Johnson: including their Tour to the Hebrides.' By the Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, LL.D., F.R.S. A new edition, thoroughly revised, with much additional matter. In one volume, 1860, p. 710. In his article on Madame D'Arblay, Lord Macaulay speaks of the editor as 'a bad writer of our own time, whose spite she had provoked by not furnishing him with the materials for a worthless edition of "Boswell's Life of Johnson," some sheets of which our readers have doubtless seen round parcels of better books.' If this had been true, no amount of revision would have made the revised edition what it is,—one of the most valuable and entertaining books in the language.

with

with the family, and was safely deposited in their comfortable house at Brighton, where he resided till their return to town on the 20th of November; making himself, during the entire six weeks, as disagreeable as he well could. Madame D'Arblay, who joined the party as Mrs. Thrale's guest on the 26th Oct. says: 'He has been in a terrible humour of late, and has really frightened all the people till they almost ran from him. To me only I think he is now kind; for Mrs. Thrale fares worse than anybody.' Boswell found him domesticated at her house in Argyll Street on March 21st, 1783, and though prepared to discover symptoms of estrangement, bears reluctant testimony to her kindness and attentiveness. That the struggle with her passion for Piozzi about this time irritated her nerves and endangered her health, is true. It did not sour her temper; and if she, naturally enough, shunned a direct explanation with Johnson, she habitually sacrificed her own feelings to spare his.

When Lord Macaulay, after landing him at 'his gloomy and desolate house behind Fleet Street,' goes on to say that 'here, in June, 1783, he had a paralytic stroke,' the reader understands, and is intended to understand, that the tie with Mrs. Thrale, severed by her act, was at an end: that he was virtually thrown off and abandoned by her. She was at Bath, but immediately offered to come to him; and on June 23rd he writes,—'Your offer, dear madam, is charmingly kind, but I will lay it up for future use, and then let it not be considered as obsolete; a time of dereliction may come when I may have hardly any other friend. Write to me very often.' During the whole of his illness he sent her a regular diary of his bodily ailments and diet; and on the 21st April, 1784, he writes: 'The Hooles, Miss Burney, and Mrs. Hale, Wesley's sister, feasted yesterday with me very cheerfully on your noble salmon. Mr. Allen could not come, and I sent him a piece, and a great tail is still left.' This brings us tolerably near the marriage with Piozzi, which took place early in July, 1784; and the tone Johnson assumed on that occasion is a decisive proof that their confidential intimacy had not been previously broken off. 'Never,' she says in her reply, 'did I oppose your will, or control your wish, nor can your unmitigated severity itself lessen my regard.'

To complete the absurdity of the position, the lexicographer, who was seventy-four, and was suspected of a wish to marry her himself, objected that Piozzi was an old and ugly dog. Lord Macaulay calls him by turns an Italian fiddler and a music-master from Brescia, in whom nobody but herself could discover anything to admire. These terms might with equal propriety be

 applied

applied to Mario or Lablache. He was half a year younger than his wife, and Madame D'Arblay describes him as 'a handsome man, in middle life, with pleasing, gentle, unaffected manners, and with very eminent skill in his profession.' 'Surely,' she adds, 'the finest sensibilities must vibrate through his frame, since they breathe so sweetly through his song.' He gave his wife no reason to repent of her choice, and she never did repent of it; nor is there any ground for supposing that the marriage seriously affected Johnson's peace of mind. He fully acted up to the principle which he laid down when Boswell asked him whether he would eat his dinner on the day one of his intimate friends was hanged. 'Yes, sir, and eat it as if he were eating it with me; why, there's Baretti, who is to be tried for his life to-morrow. Friends have risen up for him on every side, yet, if he should be hanged, none of them will eat a slice of plum-pudding the less. Sir, that sympathetic feeling goes a very little way in depressing the mind.' In the course of the three months preceding his death he paid two long visits to Dr. Adams at Oxford, one to Dr. Taylor at Ashbourne, and two to friends at Lichfield. About the same time, he told Boswell: 'Sir, I look upon every day to be lost when I do not make a new acquaintance.'

In a letter to Mr. S. Lysons from Milan, December 7th, 1784, Mrs. Piozzi writes: 'My next letter shall talk of the libraries and botanical gardens, and twenty other clever things here. I wish you a comfortable Christmas, and a happy beginning of the year 1785. Do not neglect Dr. Johnson; you will never see any other mortal so wise or so good. I keep his picture in my chamber, and his works on my chimney.' The accumulated items of the accusation against her are thus recapitulated and repelled by her editor and advocate:

'No reader will fail to admire the rhetorical skill with which the expulsion from Streatham with its library formed by himself, the chapter in the Greek testament, the gloomy and desolate home, the music-master in whom nobody but herself could see anything to admire, the few and evil days, the emotions that convulsed the frame, the painful and melancholy death, and the merry Christmas of concerts and lemonade parties, have been grouped together with the view of giving picturesqueness, impressive unity, and damnatory vigour to the sketch. . . .

'Johnson was never driven or expelled from Mrs. Piozzi's house or family; if very intelligible hints were given, they certainly were not taken; the library was not formed by him; the Testament may or may not have been Greek; his powerful frame shook with no convulsions but what may have been occasioned by the unripe grapes and hard peaches; he did not leave Streatham for his gloomy and desolate house behind Fleet Street; the few and evil days (two years, nine weeks)

weeks) did not run out in that house; the music-master was generally admired and esteemed; and the merry Christmas of concerts and lemonade-parties is simply another sample of the brilliant historian's habit of turning the abstract into the concrete in such a manner as to degrade or elevate at will. An Italian concert is not a merry meeting; and a lemonade-party, I presume, is a party where (instead of *eau-sucrée* as at Paris) the refreshment handed about is lemonade: not an enlivening drink at Christmas. In a word, all these graphic details are mere creations of the brain, and the general impression intended to be conveyed by them is false, substantially false; for Mrs. Piozzi never behaved otherwise than kindly and considerately to Johnson at any time.'

Wrong, inexcusably wrong, as Lord Macaulay palpably was, our contemporary undertook to prove him right; and the manner in which this was set about may be inferred from a passage in Mr. Hayward's Preface to the second edition of the 'Autobiography.'* 'No one likes to have foolish or erroneous notions imputed to him, and I have pointed out some of the misapprehensions into which an able writer in the "Edinburgh Review" (No. 231) has been hurried by his eagerness to vindicate Lord Macaulay.'

On turning to these so-called misapprehensions we found them to consist principally of garbled quotations and mis-statements. Johnson begins a letter to Mrs. Thrale, June 19, 1783, in a tone of querulousness not unusual to him at any time, with a doubt whether she will not pass it over with the 'careless glance of frigid indifference.' In the conclusion he says, 'You see I yet turn to you with my complaints as a settled and unalienable friend;' and adds by way of postscript, 'I am almost ashamed of this querulous letter, but now it is written let it go.' The first paragraph is quoted to prove their estrangement at the time; the conclusion and the postscript are suppressed. An important passage in Boswell describing his visit to Johnson at Mrs. Thrale's house, March 21, 1783, is manipulated in the same manner for the same purpose. An alleged quotation from Mr. Hayward's Introduction is declared by him (p. 257) to be 'an *olla podrida* of sentences torn from the context in three different and unconnected passages.' The fact that Johnson left Streatham for Brighton with Mrs. Thrale is undeniable, and its ruinous effect on the pathos of the parting scene could not be got over, but it might be weakened. So in direct defiance of the known facts, it is said that, when Johnson was at Brighton with

* 'Letters and Literary Remains of Mrs. Piozzi (Thrale).' Edited, with Notes and Introductory Account of her Life and Writings, by A. Hayward, Esq., Q.C. In 2 vols. 2nd edit. 1861.

the Thrales and Burneys, 'he seems to have lived a kind of boarding-house life' with them, and 'was not asked out into company with his fellow-lodgers.' Could the reviewer have been ignorant that the house in which they lived belonged to the Thrale family, and that both Johnson and Miss Burney were the guests of Mrs. Thrale?*

We are fully convinced that our contemporary would not have sanctioned this method of proceeding for the sake of any other author, dead or living; and we only recall attention to these misapprehensions as illustrating the means which the Macaulay school conceive justified by the end.

Another of Lord Macaulay's most characteristic passages is his description of Johnson's friend and inmate, Levet; 'an old quack doctor, who bled and dosed coalheavers and hackney-coachmen, and received for fees crusts of bread, bits of bacon, glasses of gin, and sometimes a little copper.' The only semblance of authority for these degrading details is Hawkins, who says that Levet's patients were chiefly of the lowest class of tradesmen; and that, although he was content to be paid in the way most convenient, he demanded nothing from the poor:

> 'No summons mocked by chill delay,
> No petty gains disdained by pride,
> The modest wants of every day
> The toil of every day supplied.'

On no question have Lord Macaulay's name and authority weighed more heavily and (we think) more injuriously than on the Junius question. It was one in which, for want of evidence, certainty was unattainable; one consequently in which he was pretty sure to lose patience and go astray. 'You may remember,' writes the author of Waverley in 1822, 'the neatly-wrought chain of circumstantial evidence so artificially brought forward to prove Sir Philip Francis' title to the "Letters of Junius" seemed at first irrefragable; yet the influence of the reasoning has passed away, and Junius, in the general opinion, is as much unknown as ever.' The general opinion continued in the same state till the appearance of the famous article on Warren Hastings in 1841, in which the brilliant writer unequivocally declares that, if his argument, mainly based on the very same neatly wrought chain of which Scott speaks, 'does not settle the question, there is an end of all reasoning on circumstantial evidence,' and that 'the evidence is such as would support a verdict in a civil, nay, in a criminal proceeding.' Clearly and succinctly presented in its most favourable shape by Earl Stanhope, and vehemently urged by

* See 'Autobiography,' vol. i. p. 233, and vol. ii. p. 46.

Lord

Lord Campbell, this argument beat down all opposition, if it did not command enlightened assent, until the appearance of the 'Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis,'* which was confidently announced by the chief author (an uncompromising and distinguished member of the school) as a conclusive confirmation of the creed. It was so accepted by a succession of critics, till a writer in 'Fraser's Magazine' suddenly flung down the gauntlet, declaring Francis to be little better than an impostor and those who persevered in believing in him little better than dupes. The mask was speedily cast aside, and the article has been expanded into a pamphlet, which comprises all, or nearly all, that can be urged against what (to avoid periphrase) we are content to call the Franciscan theory.† With the aid of the ample materials now placed at our disposal, we propose to sum up the evidence and pleadings in the case.

Till forty years after the last of the Junius letters, the name of Francis was never mentioned in connexion with them. This is a recognised and most important fact, for contemporaries must be acquainted with a variety of circumstances bearing on identity, of which a succeeding generation are ignorant; and most of the supposed signs and alleged coincidences, on which so much reliance has recently been placed, could not possibly have existed without exciting suspicion at the time. We feel convinced that, should the true Junius ever be discovered or made known, he will be found amongst the persons suspected by his contemporaries.

It is also remarkable that the claim, after having been started and gained ground, should have been allowed to slumber till another generation had passed away,—the generation who had personally known Francis, although not of an age to remember the first publication of the letters and the speculations concerning them. This is accounted for by Sir Fortunatus Dwarris, who lays down broadly as matter of fact, that 'no one who knew,

* 'Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis, K.C.B., with Correspondence and Journals.' Commenced by the late Joseph Parkes, Esq., completed and edited by Herman Merivale, M.A. In 2 vols. London, 1867. This book is a valuable addition to political literature, and much of it, particularly the Indian portion, will be read with interest. But the scale on which it was planned is preposterous; and the obvious incapacity of the authors to dissociate Francis from Junius checks interest and justifies distrust. Their points of similarity resemble those which Fluellen discovered between Monmouth and Macedon. A hundred of them would no more constitute a proof, than a bushel of chaff would make an ounce of bread.

† 'More about Junius. The Franciscan Theory Unsound.' Reprinted from 'Fraser's Magazine,' with Additions. By A. Hayward, Esq., Q.C. London, 1868. One of the best dissertations on Junius will be found in the 'L'Angleterre au Dix-huitième Siècle' of M. Charles de Remusat, who wavers between Francis, Earl Temple, and Lord George Sackville.

heard,

heard, or read Francis, thought him capable of producing Junius.' Among those who, to our own knowledge, came within Sir Fortunatus' description, were the second Lord Holland, the late Lord Granville, Lord Colborne, Sir Samuel Romilly, Sir Robert Peel, the late Earl of Essex, and Lord Broughton. Tierney said, 'I know no better reason for believing the fellow to be Junius than that he was always confoundedly proud of something, and no one could ever guess what it could be.'

In the Woodfall edition of 1812 there appeared for the first time a letter (brought home to Junius by the private letters), dated March 23rd, 1772, and signed *Veteran*, in which it is announced that the worthy Lord Barrington, 'not content with having driven Mr. D'Oyley out of the War Office, has at last contrived to expel Mr. Francis;' followed by a call upon these gentlemen 'to declare their reasons for quitting the office,' and the remark that 'men of their unblemished character do not resign lucrative employments without some sufficient reasons.' Whatever the circumstances under which Francis left the War-office, he clearly did not wish public attention to be directed to them, nor to have it thought that he had been expelled. Veteran was obviously ignorant that the formal resignation in March was the result of an arrangement in January. The suspicions of Lord Barrington and others who knew all about the matter, and were eager to identify Junius, were not awakened by the letter. But it gave a clue to one who read it disconnected from the period; and in 1813 appeared 'A Discovery of the Author of the Letters of Junius,' which was followed by the 'Junius Identified' of the same writer, Mr. Taylor, in 1814. The second of these publications, which asserts the sole authorship of Sir Philip, is in flat contradiction to the first, which asserts the joint authorship of Sir Philip with his father, Dr. Francis; nor was it well possible for Mr. Taylor to get clear of the dilemma in which he had involved himself by the change; for (as Mr. Hayward points out) 'the proofs and presumptions deduced from the similarity of the father's style and peculiarities of expressions, were unluckily stronger and more numerous than the corresponding proofs and presumptions relating to the son.'* And here we may remark that in the cases of all the candidates (from thirty to forty in number), peculiarities of spelling or expression are almost invariably forthcoming, like bread at a French ordinary, *à discretion;* and that in several instances the comparison of hand-

* 'There is scarcely one peculiar expression in the whole of his (Dr. Francis') Demosthenes and Horace of which an example cannot be found in the last edition of the works of Junius.'—'A Discovery,' &c.

writing

writing is boldly challenged by facsimiles, or the similarity made out by the juxtaposition of selected letters and words. The fact is, handwriting a hundred years ago was bolder, clearer, and less varied than it is now. The handwriting of a period is not unfrequently as distinctive as its costume. If the question were to be decided by handwriting, we must at once accept Mr. W. J. Smith's theory, that Lord Temple was Junius, with Lady Temple for an amanuensis. In the Private Letter, No. 6, there are three lines exactly resembling the handwriting of Boyd.

According to Lord Macaulay, 'The handwriting of Junius is the very peculiar handwriting of Francis slightly disguised.' It does not strike us to be very peculiar; it is a good bold commonplace hand, and Mr. Hayward states that he has shown specimens of the handwriting of Junius and Francis to at least thirty persons, including eminent lawyers and men of letters, who were all but unanimous that there is no similarity. The facsimiles appended to the Memoirs show none; and there are circumstances proving that the disguise must have been more than slight at all events. Francis acted as occasional amanuensis to Lord Chatham for a year and four months, and Lord Chatham's recollection of his handwriting had been refreshed by letters, transmitted through Calcraft, shortly before the receipt of a private letter from Junius in his ordinary hand (feigned or natural), being the second private letter from Junius to Lord Chatham in that hand. All the world were then speculating on the identity, and the handwriting was minutely scrutinised. How came Lord Chatham and his friends not to recognise it? or (stranger still) how came Francis to run the risk of sending anonymous letters to his old patron in his own 'very peculiar handwriting slightly disguised?'

The War Office paper turns out to be a fiction or fancy of Mr. Parkes; and Lord Macaulay's boasted argument (addressed to the publisher of this journal) to prove the connexion of Junius with the War Office, leads to an exactly opposite conclusion.* The mystification Sir Philip practised on his second wife, weakens instead of strengthening his pretensions; and Lord Campbell's statement that 'there is overwhelming evidence to prove that Sir Philip delivered the manuscript to Woodfall,' is justly cited as a specimen of the recklessness of assertion in which the supporters of the theory systematically indulge. Altogether, then, it may be fairly taken for granted that there is no direct

* 'Letter to John Murray, Esq.' Printed by Earl Stanhope, in the Appendix to the fifth volume of the last edition of his 'History of England since the Peace of Utrecht' See 'More about Junius,' pp. 35–37.

proof

proof of identity, and we perforce fall back on inference, presumption, circumstantial evidence, and probability.

What manner of man was Junius, so far as can be ascertained from his letters, public and private? What manner of man was Francis, judged by his writings and speeches, his connexions, and his life? These are the points on which it is necessary to come to some sort of understanding at starting.

The language of Junius is uniformly that of a man of rank and fortune, filling an independent and influential position in society. This is particularly discernible in his private letters. He must have had ready and constant access to the best sources of information, official, social, and political. He must have been a man of distinguished ability and conscious superiority; so distinguished indeed, and so conscious, that it is difficult to imagine him hiding his light under a bushel, and never attracting notice by a spark. He must have had ample leisure, for when charged by Horne Tooke with writing under a variety of signatures, he admits the charge, and asks: 'Is there no merit in dedicating my life to the information of my fellow subjects? What public question have I declined? What villain have I spared? Is there no labour in the composition of these letters? Mr. Horne, I fear, is partial to me, and measures the facility of my writings by the fluency of his own.' These writings founded a style, the traces of which are discernible in English literature to this hour, and they bear internal evidence of the amount of *limæ labor* bestowed upon them.*

Francis was a man of good education, who, by diligent study early in life, may be supposed to have acquired the knowledge and scholarship needed for the compositions in question. He also, for two short periods, held appointments which brought him in contact with official men of eminence, but these led to nothing, and in the twenty-third year of his age (December, 1762) he dropped into the position of first clerk in the War Office, which he retained till after the conclusion of the Junius letters, in 1772. He had no private fortune; he was always dependent upon patronage or place, and he is constantly looking to India or America as a last resort. When about twenty-two, he made an

* In conjecturing the character and qualities of Junius, Mr. Hayward lays, we think, undue stress on the Preliminary Essay to Woodfall's edition, and on the Miscellaneous Letters in that edition. The Essay was written by Dr. Mason Good, seven years after the death of H. S. Woodfall; and the Miscellaneous Letters were selected by him from the columns of the 'Public Advertiser,' without any evidence but what he deemed internal evidence of their authorship. Most of the Private Letters had no date but the day of the week. In all such instances the day of the month and the year are added by him. See 'The Grenville Papers,' vol. iii. p. lxvii.

imprudent

imprudent marriage which (no unusual consequence) lowered his society and led him to exchange habits of study for habits of dissipation. He was addicted to high play at whist, and he occasionally speculated in the funds, till stopped by a loss of 600*l.*, in 1770. He was regarded as the ablest of the subordinates at his office; and in the middle of the Junius correspondence he complains of being 'almost overwhelmed with official business.' The manner in which he employed his spare time and holidays may be collected from his private letters, *e.g.*:—

'Jan. 4, 1769.

'I am just returned from spending a riotous fortnight at Bath. Gravier and two others filled a post-coach, which was dragged with no small velocity by four horses. We travelled like gentlemen and lived like rakes.'

'Jan. 30, 1771.

'Tilman dined with me yesterday, and swallowed a moiety of two bottles of claret. . . . We lead a jolly kind of life. This night to a concert; on Thursday to a ridotto; on Saturday the opera; and on Tuesday following a grand private ball at the London Tavern.'

'July 26, 1771.

'To-morrow Godfrey, Tilman, another gent, and I, set out upon a tour through Derbyshire, and propose to reach Manchester. I wish you were of the party.'

They did not return till the 13th August, the day on which appeared the celebrated reply of Junius to Horne's letter of the 31st July. This reply, therefore, must have been composed and sent during the tour. On the 31st July, the day when Horne's letter appeared, Francis writes from Derby to his wife: 'The Duchess of Bedford, and be d—d to her, would not let us see Wooburn Abbey, which we all greatly regret.' There are frequent references in the correspondence to Junius, of whom Francis speaks carelessly and naturally; and the leading events of the day are mentioned in the same manner. There is not the slightest indication of newspaper writing or literary occupation of any sort; and the interest which he takes in politics is of a narrow and limited kind, arising either from speculations in the funds, the chance of an increase of official fees by war, or the hope of advancement through Calcraft in case of Lord Chatham's return to power. The part assigned him by Mr. Merivale in the combination against the ministry, in 1770, is subordinate and almost humiliating. 'He only approached the great man through Calcraft. His business was to collect materials for Calcraft; to stimulate him by use of the plentiful resources of his own wit, courage, and information; to act, in short, as the jackal's

jackal's provider, who was himself providing for the lion.' And was this the haughty, terrible, and dreaded Junius in the lurid splendour of his meridian? When we hear of him in this guise, not even admitted to the antechambers of the great, we are reminded of a scene in 'The Rehearsal':—

> 'The army 's at the door, and, in disguise,
> Desires a word with both your Majesties.'

Francis never had wit at any time; neither wit nor courage was required or displayed in collecting materials for Calcraft, and these materials appear to have been scanty and commonplace.* Whilst describing Francis, Mr. Merivale had Junius in his mind. So had the writers who have drawn pictures of Francis as an ardent, eager, political student, bursting with indignation at the degradation of his country, and devoting days and nights to rouse the dormant energies of his countrymen.

Early in 1771, Francis found that there was little to be expected from politics. In the 'Autobiography,' he says, 'The prospect on every side was gloomy and dispiriting. From that time I never ceased to form projects for quitting the War-office. India was the only quarter where it was possible to make a fortune, and this way all my thoughts were directed.' According to every plain common-sense interpretation of words and actions, what follows is intelligible enough. When a move took place

* See 'The Chatham Correspondence,' vol. iii. p. 444, vol. iv. pp. 48 and 128, and 'The Grenville Papers,' vol. iii. p. cxiv. Two of the three letters forwarded to Lord Chatham, and attributed to Francis, are in his handwriting. There is nothing (beyond his own assertion) to connect him, much less Junius, with the other, which is indorsed by Calcraft *anonymous;* and a very strong point has been raised upon it. If he wrote it, and was Junius, what follows (according to Mr. Merivale) is this:—He first got up a law argument carefully; stated it accurately; attended the House of Lords (Dec. 10, 1770) when it was used by Lord Chatham; was proud of its success; reported it at the time, and commented upon it; after the lapse of nearly two years reverted to it in the Preface to the collected edition, and quoted the report, thereby making the impression more durable than if the topic had been only taken up at one period and then dropped. Three years afterwards (in 1775) he has forgotten all about the matter; he is doubtful whether the point arose on the prosecution of Woodfall for publishing Junius' Address to the King; he misdescribes the letter; and he misstates the argument to an extent which proves that he never understood or mastered it at any time. See 'More about Junius,' pp. 21-23; but it seems to have escaped Mr. Hayward that Francis says nothing about the matter in a letter of December 11, 1770, to Macrabie, nor in a letter of the same date to Major Baggs, then at Cork, in which he describes a scene which he witnessed in the House of Lords on the 10th. Another odd thing has not been noticed. It is stated in the Autobiography that 'His (Lord Chatham's) speech the next day flamed in the newspapers, and ran through the kingdom.' One paper, the 'Evening Post,' published a meagre report of the speech. The rest, including the 'Public Advertiser,' took no notice of it. Parliamentary reporting was then prohibited by both Houses.

in

in the War-office, he declined the offer which 'my Lord Barrington was so good as to make me with many obliging and friendly expressions,' and resigned his clerkship. There is an interval of about a year and a half between his retirement and his Indian appointment, for which he was mainly indebted to Lord Barrington. He was about six months abroad, and the literary performance which he meditated on his return (Dec. 1772) was not exactly of a nature to call out the powers or satisfy the aspirations of Junius.

'The hopes of employment were yet distant and uncertain. The interval was to be amused, *and if possible with credit.* Mons. de Pinto's "Essay on Circulation" had fallen into my hands abroad. I thought I might reap some benefit from giving a translation of it, with notes to the public. I went over to the Hague, in May (1773), to consult the author, who received me with transports of joy.'

The completion of this work was interrupted by his Indian appointment, June 1773. The date and circumstances are utterly inconsistent with the hypothesis, adopted by Lord Campbell and favoured by Mr. Merivale, that the appointment was the price of silence. He left England for India in March, 1774. The last of the public letters under the signature of Junius appeared on January 21st, 1772. The last private letter Woodfall received from the writer is dated January 9th, 1773.

There is literally nothing in the life or correspondence of Francis to connect him with Junius during the Junian period; and this is the period to which we must mainly look for indications of identity in character, opinions, tone, taste, language, knowledge, and capacity. In the case of all other candidates, the practice has been to ascertain how far their political creed, their interests, or their likings and dislikings, agreed with Junius; and a single marked contradiction or discrepancy has repeatedly been held fatal to a claim. The Franciscan theory bristles with contradictions and discrepancies. *They* are cumulative, whatever (what Mr. Merivale calls) the convergent lines may be. We will specify a few.

Francis had every reason to be kindly disposed to Wood, Wellbore Ellis, Lord Egremont, Lord Barrington, and Calcraft. He was bound to them, not only by the common ties of gratitude, but by that species of it, the most binding of any, which has been defined a lively sense of favours to come. To weaken their influence was to destroy his own prospects. Yet, if he was Junius, he systematically assailed them all; wrote the most damaging things of Calcraft at the very moment when they were eagerly co-operating, and most rancorously abused Lord Barrington

Barrington when that nobleman was the mainstay of his fortunes, the most steadfast of his patrons, and the kindest of his friends.*

Now take the enmities and antipathies. One of the few political men of note supposed to be favoured by Junius was the first Lord Holland; and Lord Macaulay includes the strong tie between them amongst his five marks or stigmata. It is clear from the 'Autobiography' that, dating from 1763, Francis 'heartily concurred' with his father in regarding Lord Holland as a 'scoundrel' who had ill-treated them.

Junius, waving his early objections to the private character of Wilkes, adopts his cause warmly, engages in a long confidential correspondence with him, consults him about the collected edition of the 'Letters,' and takes a particular interest in his paper war with Horne Tooke. Francis never speaks otherwise than slightingly of Wilkes, and in reference to their paper war writes to his friend Baggs, at Gibraltar:—

'Wilkes and Horne have brought their villany and folly before the public.'—*Jan.* 29, 1771.

'Wilkes and Horne are at open war in the newspapers. Nothing can be more contemptible, in my own opinion, nor less interesting, than the whole of their correspondence. Horne's dislike and rancour are wretched beyond all description. The other rogue stands his ground.'—*May* 30, 1771.

There were no two men to whom Junius would have been more unlikely to refer spontaneously than Sir William Draper, whom he had stung to madness, and Sir John Burgoyne, whom he had described (14th February, 1770) as 'sitting down, for the remainder of his life, infamous and contented.' On December 11th, 1787, Francis, being put on his defence in the House of Commons for having been one of the managers of the impeachment of Hastings, stated that the persons whom he had consulted as the best judges of points of honour were Sir William Draper and Sir John Burgoyne. Draper was dead, but Burgoyne rose and handsomely responded to the appeal; which, if Francis was Junius, is the strongest example of gratuitous folly and brazen impudence on record. Why aggravate the consequences of a discovery which was always on the cards? The worst men do not accumulate baseness on baseness, or infamy on infamy, out of mere wantonness; and there is no ground for ranking Junius amongst the worst men; no ground for distrusting his solemn avowal in a private letter to Woodfall: 'After long experience

* 'I love you both (Francis and Clavering) so much that I cannot wish you to continue long in a situation so painful, though so creditable to you.' (Lord Barrington to Francis, Nov. 18, 1777.)

of

of the world, I affirm before God I never knew a rogue who was not unhappy.' His tone and conduct to Woodfall are uniformly kind, generous, and considerate. Nor was he habitually rancorous. He readily repairs the injustice of which he had been guilty to Vaughan; and in the private letter, No. 11, he writes: 'The only thing that hinders my pushing the subject of my last letter is really the fear of ruining that poor devil Gansel, and those other blockheads.'

Again, the unbroken attachment professed by Francis to the person and principles of Lord Chatham, to whom he was acting as amanuensis in 1761, and as lion's provider under Calcraft in 1770, is utterly irreconcilable with several passages of Junius, especially with the guarded panegyric, implying recent disagreement, of August 13th, 1771.

Here, therefore (including the misstatement of the law point), are no less than eleven discrepancies or contradictions, without a tittle of affirmative evidence to set against them. Nor has any one attempted to account, on the Franciscan hypothesis, for the persistent hostility, obviously envenomed by intimate personal knowledge, displayed by Junius towards the King, the Princess Dowager, the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Grafton, and many other persons of distinction, with whom a clerk in the War-office, living like Francis, had nothing in common. Junius writes in a private letter: '*Next to the Duke of Grafton*, I verily believe the blackest heart in the kingdom belongs to Lord Barrington.' Why this disagreeable precedence is given to the Duke of Grafton should be explained by those who have laboured to make out a lurking enmity to Lord Barrington.

The decided inferiority of Francis's compositions in his best days, after his Indian and House of Commons training, is hardly denied in any quarter. His style (as Mr. Merivale admits) is hard and meagre, without grace, polish, variety, or flow. He had no command of language. He could not play with words and images. He could write or speak forcibly, not elegantly. Junius was an accomplished rhetorician, which is precisely what Francis was not. The style of Junius was so peculiar, so different from anything before or after, that, if the writer had re-appeared, he would have been recognised, like the goddess by her walk—*Oh, Dea certe.* Francis was constantly writing under exciting circumstances and in the maturity of his powers. He, moreover, was always trying to write like Junius, and was never able to produce even a tolerable imitation. In his laboured letter of December 1st, 1770, to Calcraft, he may not have meant to imitate the famous letter of Junius to Lord Mansfield of the preceding 14th November, for we constantly find people reproducing unconsciously, as their own, arguments or trains of reasoning by which they had been formerly

impressed.

impressed. But it is in the highest degree improbable that Junius, a fortnight after publishing a striking letter, should sit down and compose a bad paraphrase of it. Mr. Merivale, however, thinks it more likely that Junius should have repeated himself than that another person should have repeated him; and it is absolutely necessary for Mr. Merivale to think so; for if Francis did not write both the letters, he could not have been Junius. We should, therefore, be disposed to set this down as the twelfth difficulty or labour of the Franciscan Hercules.

On what, then, does the Franciscan theory now rest? Simply on the ingrained habit of believing in it and the general unwillingness to fall back into uncertainty. Junius must have been somebody. Why not Francis? And why not Boyd, or Burke, or Singlespeech Hamilton, or Lord Lyttelton, or Earl Temple, or Lord George Sackville? If we must make a definitive choice, let us choose the best of the candidates, not the worst; and we should now place Francis nearly at the bottom of the list. But if he falls, Lord Macaulay's authority falls along with him, and a desperate rally has consequently been made to prop him up.* 'More about Junius' is set aside with an expression of surprise that so little can be said to shake the belief in the authorship of Sir Philip; his identity with Junius is taken for granted: and the very weakest of the refuted arguments are confidently reproduced.

We are told that 'the most forcible is that of time'—that 'the times at which the letters of Junius were received by Woodfall tally with the dates of Francis's known residence in London'—which they notoriously do not.

Again, that, the King and Ministry knowing Francis to be Junius, Lord Barrington knowing him to be also the author of the abusive letters under other signatures against himself, the Indian appointment was given as hushmoney, a year and a half after Junius had been hushed, through the instrumentality of Lord Barrington, who (as well as the King and Ministry) kept the secret, and who continued on the most affectionate terms with him for the remainder of their joint lives. This is pronounced to be 'the only theory which is both consistent and intelligible.'

We have seen how Francis passed his time from 1763 to 1774: during the whole eleven years there is not the slightest evidence of any literary interest or occupation except the translation of an essay on Circulation. But it seems that he was all along absorbed by the passion of writing. 'Writing was to him what *gambling was to some, intrigue to others*, hunting and racing to others of his contemporaries. It was a study, an art, a recreation, and an excitement.' Two pages further on we

* The 'Edinburgh Review,' No. 259, January, 1868, Art. VI.

find:

find: 'Only a man who could refresh himself after the labours of the study and the Council *with the diversions of gallantry and gambling*, could relieve the tame drudgery of the War-office by the indulgence of the strong political passion which breathes in every page of Junius.' This aiming at contradictory effects is somewhat in the Macaulay manner, but in the succeeding sentence the disciple has decidedly surpassed the master:—

'And only such a man could, while persecuting King, Ministers, and Judges, so baffle an inquisitive world by an alternation of impudent lying and tricky subterfuges, that not even his father, his intimate friend, his fellow-clerks working in the same office, his brother-in-law, the wife of his bosom, or the person the most interested, the printer and publisher of the letters, should ever guess who was the author! *Or had he the wonderful power to make all these persons lie on his behalf?*'

And the wonderful power to make all the rest of the world believe them when they were lying? At all events he has had the wonderful power of making clever people talk and write a great deal of nonsense, besides inducing Lord Macaulay to resort to a mode of statement which was unworthy of him. In his History, after mentioning the Irish prejudice against the Luttrells, he adds in a note:

'It is certain that very few Englishmen can have sympathised with Junius's abhorrence of the Luttrells, or can even have understood it. Why, then, did he use expressions which, to the great majority of his readers, must have been unintelligible? My answer is that Philip Francis was born and passed the first ten years of his life within a walk of Luttrellstown.'*

Francis was born in Dublin, which is seven miles from Luttrellstown, and he quitted Ireland for ever in his fifth or sixth year. It would be equally accurate to state that a man, born in London, was born within a walk of Putney, and so convey an impression that he was familiar with the traditions of the place. Junius himself assigns an English cause, perfectly intelligible to Englishmen, for his dislike of the Luttrells.

It was said of Lord Mansfield at the bar that his statement was more effective than any other man's argument, and the same might frequently be said of Lord Macaulay's statement although not in so complimentary a sense. But there is a distinction between the advocate and the historian, which the historian should keep constantly in view; and it is because Lord Macaulay has so repeatedly lost sight of it, that, with unfeigned admiration of his genius, we deprecate his example and disclaim his authority.

* Works, vol. iii. p. 451.

[illegible]

[illegible]

IN [illegible] Nature [illegible] is [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

splendid dyes from substances pitchy black. In this way our stores are replenished, and it often happens that dearth, by the energy it gives to human research, is turned into plenty. But there are thousands of materials which have long been subservient to mean purposes, and which, therefore, cannot strictly be called waste substances, that are yet capable of taking a much higher place in the world's uses. In this respect they are like men. A lucky accident may give an individual the opportunity of displaying qualities which lead to a throne; and, in the same manner, some peculiar want may transform a comparatively worthless article to a high place in commercial estimation. In the arts, vicissitudes of this kind are continually taking place. There are other matters, again, that are at present altogether undeveloped; they are visible to the eye, but we know not to what use to put them. They constitute a kind of available reserve, upon which at any moment we may have occasion to draw.

The absolute economy of Nature, which turns every scrap to some ultimate account, man has necessarily observed, and when compelled by circumstances, as in China, he has long put in practice. But our strictest economy in England is profuse waste compared with the care with which every scrap is turned by the Celestials to the best account. The pressure of population, which has brought this thriftiness about, is, however, beginning to tell upon European people; and thousands of materials are now turned to account, that not very long ago were utterly unutilised. And thriftiness begets thriftiness, as waste begets waste. There are scores of manufactures, which produce by-products, that almost necessitate supplementary factories to use them up; and we shall presently show that in one prominent article an original factory is supplemented in this manner by two others, the one digesting the other's refuse.

The refuse of one household seems an insignificant matter in detail, and not worthy of much attention; but, when it is multiplied by the 500,000 houses in the metropolis, it forms an item of no mean importance, and is of no inconsiderable value. Formerly, the dust yards, or lay-stalls, as they were called, were conspicuous by their hills of refuse, which towered high over the surrounding houses; upon these highlands swine depastured, and we are told that there was no fattening ground like these dust heaps, full as they were of all kinds of perishing animal and vegetable refuse. But the health of the metropolis was of more importance than the fattening of hogs; and for years past the dust contractors have been obliged to separate and disperse their rubbish as soon as the dust carts arrive. A more interesting

 example

example of the use of refuse could not well be afforded than we find in the yards of these dust contractors, nor a more pregnant example of the value in the aggregate of that which householders consider a mere nuisance, to be got rid of as quickly as possible. That which we throw away in the dust-bin day by day, because we fancy it is an eye-sore and past repair, is, in fact, but arrived at that stage in its existence at which it is destined to reascend in the scale of value, and once more minister to the wants of men. There is not one particle in the heap the scavenger removes from our houses that is not again, and that speedily, put into circulation and profitably employed. No sooner is the dust conveyed to the yard of the contractor, than it is attacked by what are called the 'hill women,' who, sieve in hand, do mechanically what the savant does chemically in his laboratory, separate the mass, by a rude analysis, into its elements. The most valuable of these items are the waste pieces of coal, and what is termed the 'breeze,' or coal-dust and half-burnt ashes. The amount of waste that goes on in London households in this item of coal can hardly be conceived, unless the spectator sees the quantity that is daily rescued in these yards. It may be measured by the fact, that after selling the larger pieces to the poor, the refuse 'breeze' is sufficient to bake the bricks that are rebuilding London. Most of the dust contractors are builders as well, and the breeze is used by them for the purpose of embedding the newly-made bricks into compact square stacks, which are seen everywhere in the suburbs of London. The breeze having been fired, the mass burns with a slow combustion, aided by the circulation of air, which is kept up by the method of stacking; and in the course of two or three weeks the London clay is converted into good building material. Thus our houses may be said to arise again from the refuse they have cast out, and not only are the bricks baked by their aid, but they are built in part with mortar made from the road scrapings, which is pounded granite, and combines very well with the lime and ashes of which the mortar is composed. Nay, even the compo, with which some of the smaller houses are faced, is very largely adulterated with this particular refuse.

The other constituents of the dust heap are separated by the sifters with the utmost rapidity. Round every hillock, as it is emptied, they congregate with their sieves; and in a very short space of time bones, rags, paper, old iron, glass, and broken crockery are eliminated from the mass and piled in separate heaps. The bones are put to a score of different uses. Several tons are picked weekly out of the metropolitan dust; but, of course, this does not represent the whole of the animal refuse of this

this kind, but only that taken from cooked meat. After we have discussed the joint at the table, there is still much value remaining in the residual bones. They go immediately to the boiling-houses, where every portion of fat and gelatine they can yield is extracted; the former goes to the soap-maker, the latter is utilised to make the patent gelatine packets now in use for a score of different purposes. The bones that possess any size and substance are used by the turners, and are converted into the hundreds of nic-nacks for which they are suitable; possibly, good reader, the same bone you may have picked at dinner re-enters your mouth after many changes in the shape of a toothpick or toothbrush! whilst the smaller pieces are calcined, and form the very toothpowder you use with it. But the grand destination of the smaller fragments is the earth. Ground very fine, and treated with sulphuric acid, they make the celebrated superphosphate manure, one of the best known fertilisers. Thus the old bone goes to form and nourish new bones. The wealth of England has attracted towards herself the old bones of half of the Continent, not only animal but human, for many an ancient battle-field has been searched for their valuable remains,—thereby enabling us to grow such splendid crops by supplementing the resources of our fields. Thus the threat of the Giant to Jack—

> 'Let him be live,
> Or let him be dead,
> I'll grind his bones to make my bread'—

is no fairy tale after all, but a common verity. Another very important product extracted from bones is phosphorus, a constituent of the brain and nervous system, one of the substances which give us light in the match, and without which we and our households would fare but poorly. The fat that is saved in the process of boiling goes, as we have said, to make the commoner kind of soap, or is useful to the arts in a hundred ways. What diverse forms of new life await the old bone as the rag-picker recovers it from the ash-heap! Its substance, in the form of handles of knives, chessmen, paper-knives, &c., mingles with the everyday concerns of life—its hard work and its enjoyments and intellectual amusements; whilst in its fluid and manurial products yet more astonishing changes attend it the moment it falls into the hands of the manufacturer. Its fatty particles give us cleanliness and purification in the form of the 'bar of yellow;' and its phosphorus helps to give us ready illumination. The difficulty we feel in dealing with this seeming rubbish, that we kick out of the way with our foot, is to follow it out into the many diverse forms it assumes upon its resurrection.

But there are other articles in the dust-bin which await us—for instance, there are scraps of paper. These are all carefully sorted, the white from the coloured and the printed. The soiled pieces, which cannot be profitably re-manufactured as paper, are used to make papier-maché ornaments, or dolls'-heads, &c.; the clean paper is returned to the mill, and even the printed paper has the ink discharged from it, and goes again into circulation. Old rags, of course, are valuable to the paper-maker, although the discovery of other materials will possibly render this form of waste not quite so important a matter in his eyes as it was some time ago. We shall revert to this question more at length, however, when speaking of paper-making materials. But what can be the destination of greasy dish-clouts? Woollen material, if clean, does not descend to the earth in the scale of civilisation; but there is too much grease in the dish-clout to go again to the mill, so it is destined to nourish the noble hop in the Kentish grounds. As the old saying has it, 'when things are at their worst they mend.' Woollen rags, if they happen to be dyed scarlet, are treated for the recovery of their cochineal, which is very valuable for dyeing purposes, &c.; and other valuable coloured rags are separated to be ground up and make flockpaper. But these are fancy uses: the great market for all old woollen fabrics which are too tattered to be worn, is the town of Batley and its neighbourhood, in Yorkshire, the great Shoddy metropolis. To use the words of a contemporary:—

'Not the least important of the manufacturing, is Batley, *the chief seat of the great latter-day staple of England, Shoddy.* This is the famous rag-capital, the tatter-metropolis, whither every beggar in Europe sends his cast-off gentility of moth-eaten coats, frowzy jackets, worn-out linen, offensive cotton, and old worsted stockings—this is their last destination. Reduced to filaments and greasy pulp by mighty toothed cylinders, the much-vexed fabrics re-enter life in the most brilliant forms—from solid pilot cloths to silky mohairs and glossiest tweed. Thus the tail-coat rejected by the Irish peasant, the gabardine too fine for the Polish beggar, are turned again to shiny uses; reappearing, it may be, in the lustrous paletot of the sporting dandy, the delicate riding-habit of the Belgravian belle, or the sad, sleek garment of the Confessor. Such, oh reader, is shoddy!'

We all remember how 'Devil's dust' was denounced some years ago in Parliament. If it were not for this shoddy which created it, the clothes of Englishmen, both rich and poor, would be augmented in price at least five-and-twenty per cent. As it is, a cheaper woollen garment can be purchased now than thirty years ago, notwithstanding that the expenses of living have considerably augmented since that time. Formerly these old woollen

woollen rags went to the land; but since they have been brought back to their old uses, an enormous quantity of cloth-making material has been added to the general stock. As long ago as 1858, it was estimated that 38,880,000 lbs. of this rag-wool are annually worked up into cloth, and this quantity was quite irrespective of the importations from abroad, which were very large indeed. In the nine years that have elapsed since that time the quantity must have greatly increased, yielding a quantity of wool equal to many million fleeces annually! Cotton and woollen rags are both valuable commodities when separate, but of late years it has been the custom to weave the cotton and the woollen together. The warp being of the latter material and the weft of the former, thus mixed together they were both spoilt, as they could neither be converted into paper nor cloth. Many endeavours have accordingly been made to separate them. One of these for a time succeeded. The woollen fabric was saved, and the cotton destroyed; but it has, we believe, been found that the felting qualities of the wool thus rescued were injured by the process adopted. Within these last few years the original process has been reversed. These 'Union fabrics' are now placed in a closed receiver, and subjected to steam at a very high temperature. The result is that the cotton comes out pure and fit for the paper-maker; the wool is reduced to a dark brown powder, known as the 'ulmate of ammonia,' and is employed to enrich manures which are poor in nitrogen. So much for old rags.

But we are far from having exhausted the contents of the dust-bin yet. There is the old iron, battered saucepans, old housemaids' pails, rusty hoops, horse-shoes, and nails from the road. All soldered articles have the solder extracted from them (as it is more valuable than the iron), and the cheaper metal is then remelted. The horse-shoe nails are not mixed with the common cast-iron, as they are much sought after by gun-makers for the purpose of making Stubb twist barrels. This is a roundabout way to get tough iron it is true, and it remains as an instance of an improved product brought about by accident: it is like the Chinese method of discovering roast pig. Perhaps, following out this idea, some quicker and less laborious method of making cohesive gun-barrels will be discovered than the banging of horses' feet upon the granite pavement.

Scraps of iron, it is found, may be made very useful in securing the copper that runs away in the streams washing veins of copper pyrites. In the Mona Company's mines in North Wales, old pieces of battered iron are placed in tanks into which these streams are collected; the copper quickly incrusts the iron, and in

in process of time entirely dissolves it, so that a mass of copper takes the place of the iron. The residuum, in the shape of a coloured deposit, is at times taken out, dried, and smelted. Before the adoption of this plan, a great deal of copper escaped as a refuse into the sea. Indeed, this simple laboratory device has become, during the last few years, an expedient on the manufacturing scale: the poorest copper ores, which at one time did not even pay for working, now have the metal extracted from them at a profit, by a process of which this is the penultimate stage.

Glass, so much of which in its manufactured form is destroyed in our households, is carefully collected, and of course goes again to the melting pot. The most fragile and destructible of materials when manufactured, it is, perhaps, one of the most indestructible of all known substances; and very possibly there is plenty of it which has been melted over and over again for centuries, now doing good service in the world. Glass bottles, especially physic bottles, go to the dust-yards with great regularity, and with the same regularity they find their way back to the druggists' shops, going the same dull round year after year, and no doubt are present at the death of many to whom they have ministered. Old boots and shoes, when not too far gone, find their way to Monmouth Street, Seven Dials, where they are patched up with heelball, and made to look decent, even if they should not prove very serviceable. In any case, good sound pieces of leather are turned to account. India-rubber goloshes, and all articles made of caoutchouc, whether vulcanized or not, are remelted and mixed with the new gum, the refuse being obtainable at from 17*l.* to 18*l.* per ton, and the raw material at not less than 200*l.* a ton. The dust-heap is now pretty well exhausted: there is the soft core and the hard core, the decaying vegetable matter, and the broken crockery. The former goes to feed the pigs, and the latter makes excellent foundations for roads. The vegetable refuse from Covent Garden, which is very large, is removed morning and evening, and goes to feed the cows and the pigs in the neighbourhood of the metropolis.

In turning to animal refuse, we may refer to one disgusting example in the shape of dead dogs that are seen floating on the Thames, polluting the very water we drink. Why, we ask, should they not be utilised? In Paris and New York every portion of the carcase of a dead dog is utilised: they are boiled down for the fat, whilst the skins are sold to glovers, and the bones go to make superphosphate. Every portion of a dead horse finds its use: indeed, there are a score of trades which depend upon the knacker's yard. In Paris the carcases are worth more than in this

this country, inasmuch as the working classes eat the best portions of the flesh, but otherwise the value of the different parts is about equal. The hair is a well-known refuse, used by the upholsterer, the hide goes to the tanner to make leather for large ledgers, &c., the intestines make coarse gut-strings for lathes and wheel-bands, the fat, which from a well-conditioned horse sometimes amounts to 60 lbs., is worth 6*d.* per lb. The hoofs are used either by the turners or the prussian-blue makers, and the bones go to the makers of ivory-black and turners; even the putrid flesh is allowed to breed maggots, which our Parisian friends sell as food to fatten fowls, and the final residue is turned into a trap to catch rats. Some years ago, the inhabitants of Montfauçon, near Paris, fearing that, like the Bishop of Mayence, they might be eaten up by the enormous number of rats which congregated there in consequence of the vicinity of slaughter-houses for horses, caused the Government to appoint a Commission to inquire into the matter, and the Commissioners in their report stated that the proprietor of one of the slaughter-houses had openings made in the walls, and deposited therein the carcases of two horses. When the night came he stopped up all the holes, and went in with his men to kill the rats. Night after night this trap was set, and at the end of one month he had killed 16,050 rats. As the furriers will buy them at 3*s.* a hundred for their delicate fur, he did not make a bad thing of it. The skins are also exceedingly flexible and fine, being far more resilient than even the best kid; so much so that the glovers buy them to make the thumbs of gloves.

These examples of the utilisation of the waste of great cities, although large in the aggregate and disagreeable in their details, do not strike the reader as examples of refuse noxious to the public health or deleterious to our water supply. For centuries every product that was considered worthless or a nuisance was got rid of in either of two ways. If liquid it was cast into the river, if gaseous it was allowed to escape into the air. The most important example of liquid refuse is the sewage of London. The excreta of three-and-a-half millions of people, flowing languidly in the sewers beneath their feet, was indeed an instance of refuse on such a gigantic scale, that the authorities were forced to deal with it, and the scheme of drainage just completed on the northern shore is the result. The value of this sewage Professor Way has estimated at two millions per annum, and whilst we were absolutely throwing this away we were ransacking the islands of the Pacific for guano, a refuse that had lain there for ages untouched by the hand of man. A more flagrant example of wilful waste on our part could not well

well be quoted, inasmuch as guano, though obtained at a very high cost, is not so valuable as that we had ready at hand, when in a concentrated form. Not a great many years ago the night-soil was regularly emptied from the metropolitan cesspools by a special service of nightmen, and, being mixed with ashes, was removed at once to the fields. But the invention of the water-closet destroyed this organisation. The sewage was turned into the sewers constructed to carry the rainfall only, and thence escaped into the river, after festering beneath our feet for a considerable time. The river, in consequence, was polluted, and the fish were poisoned as far as its tidal flow extended. This was to a certain extent a retrogressive step—the creation of a gigantic nuisance, and the establishment of a perpetual drain of a most valuable fertilising agent.

In China, the market-carts that bring in the vegetables to the market return with this fertilising agent properly secured, and it is at once rendered applicable to the purposes of the land. The Celestials act upon the principle that they must return religiously to the soil those materials they have taken out of it, and the result is that their fields are the most productive in the world, and have supported a larger population than any other land for a longer time. This example of the Chinese has indeed been imitated in another form in these islands for many years. Instead of carrying the sewage, it has been made to carry and distribute itself near Edinburgh for a couple of hundred years. The Craigentinny meadows were originally prolongations of the sea beach, and worth only five shillings an acre. They are flooded ten or twelve times a year with the sewage of the western part of the city, which, after saturating the soil, flows off into the Frith. There are about 200 acres thus irrigated on the catchwater system, and the crops of Italian rye-grass are prodigious, on some occasions as much as sixty tons per acre at one cutting, but averaging forty-five tons, with a money value of 25*l.* As many as five crops have been taken off in the course of one year. The success of the experiment has been ascribed to the fortunate lie of the land, which allows the sewage to flow downwards by its own gravity; but, as it is ascertained that a hundred tons of sewage can be lifted a hundred feet for a penny, the value of gravitation need not be taken much into account in the problem. The expense of irrigating these famous meadows does not exceed 1*l.* an acre per annum, and the gauge of the value of the system under which they are managed is the extraordinary rise that has taken place in the value of the meadows themselves—from 5*s.* to 30*l.* per acre. At intervals similar experiments have been made in England, notably those at Rugby and Croydon, which, being

being conducted on principles which could not well yield a decisive result, discouraged many agriculturists from using sewage; but since then many most convincing experiments conducted by private establishments have placed beyond all doubt the value of this unpleasant refuse.

The Second Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the Sewage of Towns gave the following examples in evidence. Mr. Philip Skinner Miles, a well-known agriculturist in the neighbourhood of Bristol, tried the experiment by applying the sewage of his household of thirty persons to about twelve acres of land, and the result was an immense success. The land has improved in value from 2*l.* 15*s.* an acre to 5*l.* 10*s.*, and the crops have greatly increased, and are always good, whether the season be wet or dry. At Colney Hatch and Hayward's Heath Lunatic Asylums experiments have been successfully carried out for many years; but we would more particularly refer to the schools at Anerley, containing seven hundred children, where the details were carried on under the eye of the Government Inspector, Mr. Tufnell, who testifies to the truthfulness of the results. The crops yielded seventy tons per acre, and were tried side by side with guano-manured land, and found to be far more productive. Now that a great portion of the main drainage of the metropolis on the north side of the Thames is completed, and the sewage is diverted from the stream, and conveyed to its outfall at Barking Creek, we have an invaluable fertilizer in a manageable form, pumped up to a sufficient level to command the distant sea shore of Essex. From this point a company has been formed to distribute it. Their Act entitles them to take the foreshores of Foulness Island and also of the Dingie Flat. To these areas the metropolitan sewage is to be conducted by a main and a branch conduit. Already a farm near Barking Creek in the hands of the company is under cultivation, and irrigated by the sewage-manure, and we are informed that heavy crops of Italian rye-grass have been cut. We know nothing of the Company, but we heartily hope that their scheme will succeed, inasmuch as the perfect utilisation of the metropolitan sewage will at once assure the authorities of all other towns in the kingdom of the valuable refuse which they have at their command. The Metropolitan Board, on the behalf of the ratepayers, are to receive after a certain term of years half the profits. This is as it should be. The sewage is a valuable property to be realised and distributed equally over the metropolitan area, instead of a nuisance to be got rid of. We have no doubt that fifty years hence Professor Way's estimate of its value will be greatly augmented. We hear that the authorities of Antwerp, with a population

lation of 80,000, obtain 40,000*l.* a year for their refuse dust. According to this rate the metropolitan dust ought to be worth a very large sum; and the joint return from it and the sewage will ere long be sufficient, we may hope, to pay a great portion of the local rates.

We will now draw attention to a discovery, the credit of which belongs wholly to our French neighbours, and which is one of the most singular in the history of agriculture. Sheep draw from the land on which they graze a considerable quantity of potash, much of which is ultimately excreted from the skin with the sweat. It was pointed out by Chevreul that this peculiar potash compound ('suint') forms no less than one-third of the weight of raw merino wool; while, of ordinary wools, it constitutes about 15 per cent. of the weight of the fresh fleece. As the 'suint' may be extracted by mere immersion in cold water, it is easy for the wool-manufacturers to produce more or less concentrated solutions from which the potash may be recovered by appropriate treatment. The development of the new industry is principally due to MM. Maumené and Rogelet, and their process is probably in operation at most of the great seats of the wool manufacture in France. The plan adopted by these gentlemen is a very simple one. They evaporate the solutions which are sent to them until a perfectly dry and somewhat charred residue has been obtained. This is placed in retorts and distilled, very much in the same manner that coal is distilled at gas-works; and the result is that, while much gas is evolved, which can be used for illuminating the factory, and much ammonia is expelled, which can be collected and utilised in many ways, there remains a residue, which chiefly consists of carbonate, sulphate, and chloride of potassium. These three salts are separated by the usual method, and then pass into commerce. Curiously enough, they are remarkably free from soda.

The wool manufacturers of Rheims, Elbœuf, and Fourmies annually wash the fleeces of 6,750,000 sheep; and the amount of potash, reckoned as carbonate, which these fleeces would yield, if all subjected to the new process, represents a value of 80,000*l.* But MM. Maumené and Rogelet calculate that there are seven times as many sheep in France as are included in the above estimate; and this will enable us to judge of the enormous loss in potassic constituents which the soil of an agricultural district has to suffer. The practical and very obvious moral supplied by these facts does not yet appear to have penetrated the mind of the British farmer. Nevertheless, we owe a duty to the soil, and the neglect of it may almost be considered as a crime.

Gas-tar, and ammoniacal liquor from the gasworks, not many years

years ago formed one of the most repulsive nuisances known to manufacturers. It was either thrown into the river, where it floated in ghastly blue patches, under the name of Blue Billy; or, as at Edinburgh, was conveyed away stealthily at night and emptied into the sea. These offensive products have within these last few years been distilled and transferred into a number of liquids and solids, all of which are more or less valuable. The gas-tar, a material with soiling powers unequalled, and with an odour that is unapproachable, yields benzol, an ethereal body of great solvent powers, which forms the principal constituent of 'benzine,' the most effectual remover of grease stains known, and generally used to renovate kid gloves. Benzol produces with nitric acid, nitro-benzol, a body resembling in odour bitter almond scent, which is largely employed in perfuming soap. Could any two products appear more antagonistic to the substance from which they spring? From the same tar we have various mixtures of substances chemically similar to benzol. These are popularly known as 'naphtha.' One liquid of this kind is the gas-substitute of the peripatetic costermonger and cheap Jack, besides being the source of illumination of many large factories and yards in which night-work is done. Another of them, mixed with turpentine, is at once elevated to the dignity of the drawing-room, where it appears in the table lamp as camphine. Naphtha is also frequently used in dissolving resins, india-rubber, and gutta-percha. Lampblack is made by burning, with slight access of air, the least volatile components of gas-tar. Moreover, if these be melted and mixed with pebbles, a valuable paving material is produced, with the appearance of which most of us are familiar. Red dyes, but, unfortunately, of only ephemeral beauty, can be made from that once dread enemy to the gas manufacturer, naphthaline. The singular thing is that, when distilled at a lower temperature than is required to form gas, oil comes over in which is comparatively much paraffin. It is not, however, from coal, but from certain shales, that the most abundant yield of paraffin is thus obtained. This beautiful, white, and crystalline product has been applied to several purposes. When mixed with about two per cent. of stearin, excellent and very cheap candles can be made of it. Melted with a little oil, it furnishes, as Dr. Stenhouse has shown, the best waterproofing agent, perhaps, that we possess. It may also be turned to good account as a lubricant for machinery: and, lastly, it is an essential ingredient in 'paraffin oil,' the manufacture of which has acquired, during the last decade, such gigantic proportions. The watery tar-liquor contains ammonia, very extensively used in the arts. If the ammonia produced in coke-making could be

be saved, as proposed by Dr. Lyon Playfair, it would be a great gain to agriculture, as from the million tons of coke annually made in England at least sixty tons of sulphate of ammonia that is now wasted could be utilised. Mr. Crace Calvert, in his paper read at the Society of Arts, referring to hydrochlorate of ammonia, pointed out that originally the only source from which it was procured was a district in Egypt, where it was obtained in the form of sal ammoniac, by heating in glass vessels the soot which had been produced by the burning of camels' dung. Now, by the aid of science, we can obtain it from a score of sources without going so far for it at charges so costly; and one of these sources is the watery tar-liquor to which we have just alluded, which yields crude sal ammoniac when evaporated with hydrochloric (muriatic) acid. We had forgotten to mention that among the light oils of tar were some which, mixed with the heavy oils, are very effective in preserving wood from rotting, and a very singular product called tar-creosote or carbolic acid, which is one of the most remarkable antiseptics in existence, and is evidently destined to play a great part in the world. In the last visitation of cholera to London, thousands of gallons of carbolic acid were used to disinfect the courts and alleys of the City; and, according to some experiments of Mr. Crookes, the cattle-plague itself promises to succumb to this remarkable agent.

The by-products of gas-works are now so valuable that factories are actually set up beside them for the purpose of working them up. On Bow Common a company, under the name of the Gas Products Utilising Company, is thus located beside the Great Central Gas Company. Many of the products mentioned above are made here, beside others, the most important of which is alum. This product, like sal ammoniac, once came at a great cost from Egypt, but is now mainly procured from an aluminous shale, which forms the roof of coal-mines, and which has to be brought to the surface before the coal can be gained. This was for a long time a perfect refuse material, covering acres of ground like the spelter and cinder heaps, but chemistry has found it out, and is now converting it into the product which is so valuable to our dyers and calico-printers. This product is made at the works we have mentioned by setting fire to the shale—the carbon and sulphur it contains being sufficient for that purpose—and treating the friable porous residuum in iron pans with sulphuric acid, to which is added the ammonia from the gas-liquor, and the three bodies combine with water to make common or ammoniacal alum.

When one goes over this remarkable list of materials called forth

forth by the aid of chemistry from the homogeneous looking substance coal, one almost wonders when they will come to an end: from the black material they issue forth like the prisoners rising from the gloomy doorway of the prison-house in 'Fidelio,' and like them they come forth to liberty, to enter into new combinations. We may mention that from one of the products of the coal distillation made at this factory at Bow is prepared the impure muriate of ammonia in crystals, to which we have already referred; and in order to work up this salt into the 'sal ammoniac' of commerce a chemical firm has built a factory adjoining. Thus three laboratories placed side by side pass on from one to the other products, which, in the passage, suffer transformations quite as remarkable as any that we read of in Arabian story.

Another material which was for a long time considered a noxious refuse in the old method of manufacturing Price's patent candles from palm-oil is glycerine, a colourless, inodorous, sweet, syrupy body. The object in the manufacture of the candles made from this oil was to eliminate this substance, which obstructed the steady burning of the candle, and caused an unpleasant smell when the charred end of the wick gave forth smoke. By the process now adopted, steam at a temperature of 550° to 600° Fahrenheit is introduced into a distillatory apparatus containing a quantity of palm-oil. The neutral fats and oils act chemically on the steam, forming fatty acids and glycerine, both of which are then distilled together into a receiver, when the condensed glycerine, being of a greater specific gravity than the fatty acids, sinks below them, and is easily filtered away. Formerly this glycerine passed off into the Thames as a refuse substance: in this manner, when the Belmont works were making their full supply of candles, this useful material escaped to the value of 400*l.* per week! Glycerine is very valuable in certain skin diseases and ear affections, and it is found to be an admirable means of preserving all perishable matters, meat and fish being kept in it for months perfectly fresh.

The value of scientific knowledge in the production of materials involving large commercial interests is especially exemplified in this happy discovery. In many trades the by-products alone give the profit, in these days of keen competition, and the abler the chemist who presides in such establishments, the more these by-products are likely to be remunerative. The rule of thumb which has so long obtained, will no longer avail us now that we have to compete with the able and scientific manufacturers of France, Belgium, and Germany.

Perhaps no refuse of any manufacture, with the exception of those

those of alkali-works, has such a prejudicial effect upon both animal and vegetable life as the vapours given off in the process of smelting copper. Those who have visited the Vale of Neath and the country around Swansea know to what a desolate condition vegetable life is reduced for miles by the escape of these fumes in an easterly direction. Edward Vaughan, Esq., of Rheola in the Vale of Neath, writing in September, 1865, to the 'Times' respecting this nuisance, says:—

'I lately sat upon a committee for the new assessment of tenements to poor and county rates in Glamorganshire. The valuation of hundreds of acres in the neighbourhood of Swansea had to be reduced one-half, as young stock cannot be reared at all, and cows and horses kept upon the grass soon die of salivation. I reside seven miles from any copper-works: even at that distance the smoke reaches me; and, finding that a large wood of five hundred acres was pining, I sent specimens of it to one of the most eminent analytical chemists in London; the reply was, that "the specimens gave sulphuric acid, and recognisable quantities of arsenic." I calculate that the surface of more than twenty thousand acres of land in the neighbourhood of Swansea and Neath is now undergoing a gradual process of destruction.'

Mr. Vaughan commenced an action against the Governors and Company of the Copper-miners of England, which consists of not more than half a dozen persons, to abate the nuisance, and they have agreed to do so in a couple of years. Mr. H. H. Vivian, of the Hafod works, is the only copper-smelter who has ever taken any steps to arrest the deleterious fumes which are doing so much damage; and now we understand he has, by the adoption of a calcining furnace invented by Mr. Gerstenhoffer, partially succeeded; at least two-thirds of the sulphurous acid gas given off in the calcining process is converted into sulphuric acid, to the amount of thousands of tons a week, and in this form is utilised in making superphosphates. As we have before pointed out, there seems to be some element really retributive and curative in the process noxious works have to go through. As in the gas factories the most repulsive smells and the most unsightly and soiling refuse yield the most delicate essences and the most charming dyes, so in these copper-smelting works which destroy vegetation a by-product is yielded which, in conjunction with bones, makes one of the best fertilisers known.

Scarcely any fumes are perceptible from the tall chimney-stack which conducts the smoke above the neighbouring hills. The arsenic, being more easily condensible, is caught in the roasting flues, and is regularly collected. If it is found that the evil complained of should not be remedied by these steps, which the other

other smelting firms are narrowly watching, in all probability copper-works will be brought under the provisions of the Alkali Works Act, as it is unbearable that, for the profit of a few gentlemen, a country as large as many a German principality should be reduced to a condition of sterility.

Let us for a moment turn from this desolate scene to a more attractive subject,—from the fumes that destroy life to Arabian odours that render it attractive. To chemistry, modern perfumery is perhaps more indebted than any other art that conduces to the luxury of life. Nearly every article of the toilet-bottle or the sachet is made from waste, sometimes from most inodorous matters. It is generally supposed that all the essences of flowers are produced by distillation: this is far from being the case; some of them would be seriously injured by such a process, and are caught and fixed, as it were, by what may be termed a fat-trap. In the flower season at Cannes, plates of glass are thinly covered with clarified inodorous fat; upon or under this fat the flowers are placed, and the power this substance has to absorb and retain perfumes is astonishing. On these sheets of glass the most delicate odours are thus fixed, almost as securely as, on the collodion-prepared plates, the most delicate pictures are retained. In this way the jessamine, the violet, the tuberose, and orange perfumes travel across France, and arrive here as pure as the day they were given forth from the flowers themselves. The emancipation of the odour from its imprisonment is very simple; the fat cut into small cubes is placed in spirits of wine, and the delicate essence immediately deserts the coarse fat for the more spiritual solvent. It may not be quite correct to speak of these odours as waste matters, because the flowers are grown for the purpose of their production and for that only, but there are many fragrant airs which now go to waste in our gardens that may be secured with a little trouble. Mr. Piesse, in his interesting work on perfumery, says that, 'whilst cultivators of gardens spend thousands for the gratification of the eye, they altogether neglect the nose. Why should we not grow flowers for their odours as well as for their colours?' and we may add that ladies may utilise some of our own waste garden perfumes very easily and with pecuniary advantage to themselves. Heliotrope, the lily of the valley, honeysuckle, myrtle, clove pink, and wallflower perfumes, such as we get in the shops, are made up odours cunningly contrived from other flowers. Yet they may be made pure with a little trouble. 'I want heliotrope pomade,' says Mr. Piesse in despair; 'I would buy any amount that I could get.' And the way to get it is very simple. If there is a glue-pot in the house, and it happens to be clean, fill it with clarified fat, set it near the hot-house fire,

or

or any other fire, just to make the fat liquid, and throw in as many heliotrope flowers as possible, let them remain for twenty-four hours, strain off the fat and add fresh ones, repeat this process for a week, and the fat will have become a pommade à la heliotrope. The same process may be gone through with all the other flowers mentioned. A lady may in this manner make her own perfume, and we may add in the words of Mr. Piesse, 'one that she cannot obtain for love or money at the perfumer's.' The same gentleman, in a letter to the 'Society of Arts' Journal,' draws attention to the fact that flowers of great value are a real waste product in our colonies. 'In Jamaica, St. Helena, and many other places, orange-blossoms and jessamine flowers are very abundant, but no effort is made to save or economise their fragrance, although the ottos procured from them are nearly as valuable as gold, weight for weight, and for these England pays pretty dearly to France and Italy.'

Some of the more delicate perfumes are entirely guiltless of ever having had their homes in flowers; indeed they are made by chemical artifice, concocted in short from oils and æthers, many of them of a most disgusting kind, the by-products and refuse of other matters. Professor Lyon Playfair, in a lecture delivered in 1852, referring to the Exhibition of the preceding year, says,—

'Commercial enterprise has availed herself of this fact, and sent to the Exhibition, in the forms of essences, perfumes thus prepared. Singularly enough, they are generally derived from substances of intensely disgusting odour. A peculiarly fœtid oil, termed "fusel" oil, is formed in making brandy and whisky. This fusel oil, distilled with sulphuric acid and acetate of potash, gives the oil of pears. The oil of apples is made from the same fusel oil by distillation with sulphuric acid and bi-chromate of potash. The oil of pine-apples is obtained from a product of the action of putrid cheese on sugar, or by making a soap with butter and distilling it with alcohol and sulphuric acid, and is now largely employed in England in the preparation of pine-apple ale: oil of grapes, and oil of cognac, used to impart the flavour of French cognac to British brandy, are little else than "fusel" oil.

'The artificial oil of bitter almonds, now so largely employed in perfuming soap and flavouring confectionery, is prepared by the action of nitric acid on the fœtid oils of gas-tar. Many a fair forehead is damped with the oil de mille fleurs, without knowing that its essential ingredient is derived from the drainage of the cowhouse! The winter-green oil imported from New Jersey, being produced from a plant indigenous there, is artificially made from willows, and a body procured from a distillation of wood. All these are a direct modern appliance of science to an industrial purpose, and imply an acquaintance with the highest investigations of organic chemistry. Let us recollect that the oil of lemon, turpentine, oil of juniper, oil of roses, oil of copaiba,

copaiba, oil of rosemary, and many other oils, are identical in composition, and it is not difficult to conceive that perfumery may derive still further aid from chemistry.'

Dyes, like perfumes, are often derived from the most repulsive sources: gas-tar gives the magenta and mauve so fashionable of late; picric acid from the same source produces orange and yellow tones. The beautiful colour ultramarine was formerly made of Lapis Lazuli, and was far too precious an article to be used by the calico-printers, but the modern chemist, having discovered the elements of which it is made, now builds it up artificially. This is one of the most striking results of scientific knowledge, and was probably the first triumph of synthetical chemistry. The costly pigment, that we treasured up, is now made artificially at 1*s.* per pound! The method of applying it to cloth is very ingenious. As it is insoluble, how was it to be made to adhere to the material? Chemists answered the question by mixing it with albumen, which, coagulating by heat, fixed it firmly on the fabric to which it was applied. The waste heaps of spent madder were formerly a great nuisance, and were often thrown away, of course into those great carriers—streams and rivers; hence the water in the neighbourhood of dye-works was always polluted; it is now found that at least one-third of this hitherto waste product can be saved by being treated with a hot acid. Prussian blue is made from pieces of horse-hoof, or refuse woollen material, by fusion with iron and alkali. A few years ago the scientific world was startled by the announcement that means had been arrived at of extracting the green colouring matter (chlorophyll) from grass, leaves, &c. To utilise the bloom of spring was indeed a daring idea, and by no means impossible of accomplishment; but that excellent intention has been baffled by the extreme alterability of the colour in question.

The refuse vitreous product of smelting furnaces, which is more commonly known under the term 'slag,' is produced in such prodigious quantities, that few people who have travelled can have failed to observe the manner in which it encumbers the ground in the neighbourhood of large iron foundries, where, indeed, it rises to the dimensions of high hills, and often covers many acres of ground. The manner in which it is going on increasing is very extraordinary; not less than eight million tons a year are produced in Great Britain alone. If any use could be made of this waste, the profit to the iron-master would be great; for, independently of the room it takes up, the cost of removing it is never less than a shilling, and sometimes amounts to three shillings, per ton. Of course many attempts have been made to turn it to account, but hitherto without much success; in the neigh-

bourhood of iron foundries are walls built of slabs, with bevilled coping-stones cast in this material, and they appear to be indestructible, but those we have seen are too ugly in appearance, being rough and black, to gain the attention of the architect; yet there seems no reason why the material may not be improved and used ornamentally in building. An American gentleman some few years ago took out patents in various countries for its application to ornamental purposes, but he proposed not to take the slag with all its impurities as it comes from the furnace, but to refine and purify it, and, if necessary, to impart to it different colours. Slag is, in fact, very like lava, and is allied nearly to the rocks of igneous origin which form our most durable building stone. But granite itself is far below purified slag in density and powers of resistance to crushing; this substance, indeed, bears six times the pressure of the black marble of Italy, one of the hardest building materials ever used. When purified from mechanical mixtures, slag will run into moulds and take delicate impressions, which render it very valuable for all kinds of ornamental work. The vitreous nature of the material makes it particularly applicable for building purposes in all places where moisture has to be encountered; every common brick, it is well known, takes up one pound of water, whereas these slag-made slabs are impervious to wet, and are almost indestructible. Some tiles made of this material were laid down in the Place de la Bourse, in Paris, some years since, and may be there now for what we know to the contrary.

Perhaps the most important refuse product that can be mentioned as proceeding from a systematic manufacturing process is that known as 'soda waste.' Large quantities of this substance are rejected as useless by most alkali-works; and it has been for many years at once a problem and a reproach to chemistry. The magnitude of our loss may be imagined, when we reflect upon the fact that almost the whole of the sulphur employed in making washing-soda is removed, in chemical combination, as a constituent of this waste. Such a circumstance did not, of course, escape the attention of scientific men; and many methods, some of them extremely ingenious, were devised for the recovery of the sulphur. All of these, though succeeding completely from a chemical point of view, shared in one important defect,—they did not pay the manufacturer. The offensive heaps, therefore, continued to be a most serious local annoyance, by evolving foul and injurious gases, and were a source of litigation until, within only the last few years, the final removal of the nuisance was satisfactorily accomplished, and declared to be a profitable undertaking. The processes in actual employment would

would not be understood by a non-technical reader; but we may state that none of them involve the introduction of any material which the works themselves do not at present furnish. France has, perhaps, taken the lead in this matter; but several English manufactories are busy, and successful, at the new processes. Some of the sulphur thus prepared was shown at the last Exposition in Paris; but much of it is converted into hyposulphites, another form in which it has been several times exhibited. Both the sulphur and hyposulphites thus produced are now made on a very large scale, and the recovery is complete. We may, then, congratulate ourselves on having witnessed this important and, indeed, necessary victory.

The utilisation of the waste food of South America, if it could be accomplished profitably, would be the greatest possible boon to the poor. In the vast prairies of America, extending from the Mississippi to the Missouri, bisons roam freely in droves too large for the eye to compass, but certainly numbering many hundred thousand beasts. In the Pampas of Buenos Ayres the wild oxen are at present slaughtered at the rate of four hundred thousand annually for their hides and skins, the flesh being an absolute waste, civilisation not having yet arrived in these regions at the simple process of cutting the flesh into long slips, and then drying it in the sun, in which form it comes from the River Plate to the Southern States of America, and is there eaten by the negro population in the form of jerked beef. In Moldavia and Wallachia there is an abundance of ox flesh wasted, the immense herds of this quarter of Europe being slaughtered simply for their fat and horns. Some of this beef, and some also from Australia, has come over to this country in hermetically sealed cases, and capital food it is, much better than the salt junk upon which we used to feed our navy, but it has not yet made a footing among our population, although it can be sold in London at sixpence a pound.

Mr. Simmonds, in a paper contributed to the 'Journal of the Society of Arts,' in speaking of the vast sources of unutilised food that exist in different quarters of the globe, states that the quantity of animal matter wasted in the Newfoundland cod-fishery is 120,000 tons annually. Surely, if none of this can be secured for food, it may be made available for some other useful purpose. Professor Way has, we understand, prepared a manure from refuse fish which contains a very high percentage of ammoniacal salts and phosphate of lime. We are told, indeed, that the guano islands will be exhausted by the year 1888, or thereabouts, and if in the mean time we have not brought our own sewage into use, our agriculturists will be sorely pressed for a powerful fertiliser. The enormous number of horses in Buenos Ayres renders them of little

 commercial

commercial value, but it is certainly odd to hear that the number of mares slaughtered in that country merely for their hides and grease is so great that it is found economical to light the city of that name with gas made from the fat of these animals. Again Mr. Simmonds tells us that from 15,000 to 20,000 elephants are killed annually to furnish the ivory used by the Sheffield manufacturers. Elephant's flesh is very good; and the late Mr. Gordon Cumming spoke rapturously in his volumes on African travel of the delicacy of elephant's feet: not that we think it likely that the flesh of this animal will ever come into use among ourselves, or that we shall ever benefit by the superfluity of green turtle to be found in the bays of the Bonin Islands, where they are so numerous "that they quite hide the colour of the water, and many are from 6 to 8 cwt. each." Possibly if we cannot bring the turtles to our Aldermen, in times to come our Aldermen may make trips to this turtle paradise. But there is no knowing what science may do for us even with respect to preserving all this superabundant flesh and green fat. Who would have dared to predict five-and-twenty years ago that pine-apples would be sold about the streets at 6*d.* each, and would become as familiar to our street gamins as apples?

Among the more curious examples of the use of refuse, we may mention that album graecum is collected from the dog-kennels, for the purpose of cleansing the pores of goat-skins previously to their being tanned for Morocco leather. As many as fifty people, we are told, whose wages are not less than 5000*l.* a year, are employed in collecting this substance in the metropolis. The production of albumenized paper for the purposes of the photographer consumes a large number of the whites of fresh eggs, and consequently the yolks for a considerable time were considered a waste substance. In France, where they are very quick at utilizing any refuse-matter, a maker of 'colifichets'—those fashionable unfashionable articles, whether food for man or bird the Britain is at a loss to make out—was some years ago suddenly enabled to cut out all the rivals in his trade by the low price at which he sold them. After a little time the mystery came out: these 'colifichets' are made principally of the egg-yolk, and to provide this ingredient the clever Frenchman had made a contract with all the principal photographers for the cheap purchase of this refuse of their profession. In England the confectioners now obtain this substance from the same source. There must be a great abundance of it in the market, and in consequence cheesecakes ought to be cheap: at all events the price should depend upon the fluctuations of personal vanity. When there is a great run upon the photographers, in fine weather, there ought

ought to be a decline in this particular delicacy. Old and spoiled photographs themselves are a very valuable waste, in consequence of the amount of gold and silver they contain, which is recovered by simply burning them, and from the washings of the prepared paper they are secured by evaporation. The amount of refuse silver thus recovered amounted in one large photographic paper establishment to 1000*l.* in one year. Every refuse of the precious metals is most carefully collected. A jeweller's leather, old and well worn, is worth a guinea; and what are termed 'sweeps,' or the dust collected in the leathern receptacle that is suspended under every working jeweller's bench is a regular article of trade. A worker in the precious metals can always obtain a new waistcoat for an old one, in consequence of the valuable dust adhering to it. Bookbinders doing a large business tell almost incredible tales of the amount of gold they collect from the floors and the rags of the binders.

To the literary world the utilisation of some waste or undeveloped substance, as a substitute for, or aid to rags, in the manufacture of paper, must be a matter of great interest; for, whilst many sources from which we once procured rags are now cut off, the cheap literature of the country has increased the demand in an extraordinary degree. The reduction of the stamp duty has enormously augmented the sale of newspapers, and the paper-makers have consequently long been at their wits' end to find some new material suitable for paper-making. In looking over the patents that have been taken out during the last twenty years for such fibres for this purpose, it is impossible to avoid being struck with the number that have been put forth as suitable. Wood shavings, nettles, hop-bines, bindweed, the barks of various trees, in fact every material of a fibrous nature that will pulp, has been proposed and eagerly supported. Among all these, two only have come before the world commercially—straw and Esparto. The former cannot be called a waste material, inasmuch as it is already extensively used for a variety of purposes, therefore any new demand upon it must certainly end in considerably increasing its value, and therefore in withdrawing it from many uses to which it is at present applied. It cannot be denied, however, that it makes a very good manuscript paper, but for books and newspapers the amount of silica it contains renders it very brittle. The 'Morning Star' is or was printed upon it, and it is more or less in demand; but the paper-makers tell us the trade do not like it, and they have long been eager for some more tenacious substance. This they appear to have at last obtained in esparto. In looking back at the list of patents we find that this substance was made the subject of one in 1852 by Jean Antoine Farina, and

again

again in 1854 and 1856 by James Murdock and Thomas Routledge. Indeed the French Government, previously to the earliest of these dates, had its eye upon this useful grass as a substitute for rags; specimens of it, and also of paper made from its fibre, were to be seen in the Algerian section of French products, in the Exhibition of 1851. The 'Akhbar' daily paper has been printed in Algiers for years upon it, and it was introduced to the whole world in the 'Exposition' of last year—the catalogue of which is printed upon paper made from esparto alone. The grass known to botanists by the name Stipa (or macrochloa) tenacissima grows wild upon both sides of the Mediterranean, for about five degrees of longitude. It comes, on the European side, from the east coast of Spain, principally from Carthagena, Almeria, Aquelas, &c., where it has long been used for making mats, ropes, soles of sandals, and the Iberian scourges of Horace (Epod. iv.); and it appears that any quantity of it may be obtained from Algeria, where it is a most abundant weed. We have by us at the present moment a bundle of this weed, sometimes miscalled broom, some pulp, and some paper made from it. It is white and very tenacious in fibre, and we hear that, after rags, it is certainly the best material yet discovered for the making of paper. The favour in which it is held by the British paper-maker may be gathered from the fact that between 65,000 and 70,000 tons of this broom were imported into this country for paper-making purposes in the year 1866. It was imagined that in the opening of the China trade large supplies of cotton refuse would be obtainable from the teeming population of that country, but it was soon found that all old rags in that provident empire were used up in making the thick soles of boots.

Within the limits of this article, of course it is only possible to touch upon the more important examples of the use of refuse. There are doubtless many that we have omitted to mention, that might have been included with advantage, but we have given examples enough to show that civilisation is every day adding enormously to the useful products of the world, both by economising her resources, and by calling new ones forth by the aid of chemistry. In conclusion, we may allude to one matter which concerns us as a manufacturing nation most nearly. Shall we ever discover, and be able to utilise, new combinations of the forces of Nature? Mr. Babbage thinks so; and however much practical men may regard this as a philosophical dream, it should be remembered that the dream of one age is not unfrequently the reality of those which succeed. When Franklin drew electricity from the clouds by means of a kite-string, he would hardly have dared to hazard the prophecy that in the next century

century a string of copper stretched under the ocean, would form the tongue of two distant nations. If coal should fail us, as many people believe will be the case after the lapse of a few centuries, we shall have to fall back upon the more directly exerted forces of Nature, among which are the rise and fall of the tides, and the tremendous manufactories and warehouses of heat that are situated in volcanic mountains. Mr. Babbage in his 'Economy of Manufactures,' makes a forecast respecting the possible sources of such power, and the method by which it may be exported by the aid of another waste material, namely, ice. The following paragraph gives us a notion of what may be in the future a gigantic use of that which at present is not only a refuse, but sometimes a very mischievous power:—

'In Iceland the sources of heat are still more plentiful; and their proximity to large masses of ice seem almost to point out the future destiny of that island. The ice of its glaciers may enable its inhabitants to liquefy the gases with the least expenditure of mechanical forces; and the heat of its volcanoes may supply the power necessary for their condensation. Thus, in a future age, *power* may become the staple commodity of the Icelanders, and of the inhabitants of other volcanic districts; and possibly the very process by which they will procure this article of exchange for the luxuries of happier climates, may in some measure tame the tremendous elements which occasionally devastate their provinces.'

This is indeed a tremendous prophecy, but did not the Greeks anticipate Mr. Babbage when they made Etna the forge of Vulcan?

ART. III.—1. *Posthumous Works of the late Reverend Robert South, D.D., containing Sermons on several Subjects, an Account of his Travels into Poland, Memoirs of his Life and Writings, &c.* 1 vol. London, 1717.

2. *Opera Posthuma Latina Viri Doctissimi et Clarissimi* Roberti South, S.T.P., Eccl. Westmonast. et Ædis Christi, Oxon. Canonici, &c. Nunc primum in lucem edita. Londini, 1717.

3. *Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book, entituled 'A Vindication of the Holy and Ever-blessed Trinity,' &c.* By a Divine of the Church of England (R. South). London, 1693.

4. *Tritheism charged upon Dr. Sherlock's New Notion of the Trinity. And the Charge made Good, &c.* By a Divine of the Church of England (R. South). London, 1695.

5. *Sermons preached upon Several Occasions.* By Robert South, D.D.,

D.D., Prebendary of Westminster, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. A New Edition, in four volumes, including the Posthumous Discourses. London, 1843.

MR. HENRY HOLBEACHE tells us that all mankind may be divided into two great classes, Cavaliers and Roundheads. The Cavaliers are those vigorous, prosperous gentlemen, who instinctively respect constituted authorities and venerate tradition, who find their proper place amid the decencies and respectabilities of an ancient and undisturbed society, who are ready with sword or pen to maintain that state of things in which they have themselves happily grown up, and look with dislike and contempt upon all movers of ancient landmarks. On the other hand, the name 'Roundhead' is given to the ragged regiment of those who are ready to fight for an idea; who are at war with the easy routine and comfortable order of established civilisation, and wish to reform society on principles which seem to them not only true, but of the utmost importance to man.

Perhaps it may seem a little fanciful to extend the well-known party names of our seventeenth-century struggle to the great contest always going on in the world between old habit and innovation, but at least no one will hesitate to recognise in Robert South the very type of a Cavalier preacher, in the proper sense of the term. We can well believe that, at an age when a man's blood is generally somewhat cooled, he professed his readiness to exchange cassock for buff-coat to aid in putting down Monmouth's rebellion; for we see in his works an air of burly defiance, and an eagerness to slash with his keen blade at any enemy who presents an opening, which tell of a spirit akin to that which charged with Rupert against the stern ranks of the Ironsides. Such a warrior-divine as South is only produced in an age when vigorous combats are waged with no blunted swords. The definiteness of thought, the keenness of animosity, the vigour of invective which distinguish this famous preacher, are the product of an age of contention, and a society cultivated indeed, but not delicate or scrupulous.

Robert South was throughout his long life a prosperous man. His father was a London merchant in easy circumstances, and in his country house at Hackney the future preacher was born in 1633. In due time, probably about 1646 or 1647, he was sent to Westminster School, then rising to the height of its fame, where he became a King's Scholar. The head-master was Richard Busby, the most famous teacher of that time, whose keen glance saw the hidden

hidden talent in the 'sulky boy' put under his charge;* one of the ushers, during a part at least of South's school-time, was Adam Littleton, expelled from Oxford for his frank avowal of royalist opinions; an excellent scholar and theologian, afterwards well known as the author of a much-used Latin-English Dictionary. And among the boys at Westminster in South's time were found several who afterwards made themselves a name in the world beyond the cloisters. Here he may probably have seen James Heath, whose 'Brief Chronicle' and 'Flagellum' have earned him in our own days the nick-name of *Carrion* Heath; Nathaniel Hodges, the brave physician who remained in London, when many fled, to care for the sufferers in the terrible year of the Plague; Philip Henry, the nonconformist divine, father of the better-known Matthew, the commentator; John Mapletoft, physician and theologian, one of the founders of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel; Henry Stubbe, the Bodleian Librarian, noted in after-time for the contempt he poured on the Royal Society; Robert Hooke, one of the most distinguished members of that Society, who at school 'invented thirty several ways of flying,'† and at Oxford initiated Robert Boyle into the Cartesian philosophy; a greater than any of these, John Dryden, who was nearly of his own standing; and, somewhat his junior, a thoughtful boy from Somersetshire, John Locke, afterwards to follow Shaftesbury into exile and be deprived of his studentship, while his old schoolfellow, a prosperous dignitary, was at the height of his fame. We can hardly imagine that there was, even in boyhood, any very warm friendship between the arrogant and vehement South and the candid and tolerant Locke; and when the preacher, years afterwards, spoke of some who had gone forth from the school 'who did unworthily turn aside to other by-ways and principles' than the usual loyal ones of Westminster, he may possibly have glanced at Locke's Whig principles. Probably no schoolmaster ever sent forth so many pupils distinguished in after life in Church and State, in policy and science, as Dr. Busby from Westminster, over which he presided for more than half a century.

South was at Westminster while the Long Parliament, sitting hard by, attempted to govern England; if the Westminster boys then enjoyed the privilege of entering the house while a debate was going on, he may have seen Speaker Lenthall in the chair,

* We may conjecture that South was soundly flogged at school, to judge from the feeling way in which he deprecates excessive flogging in the sermon 'On the Education of Youth.'—(*Sermons*, ii. 292.)

† Wood's 'Athenæ,' iv. 628 (Ed. Bliss).

and

and heard the debate on the Remonstrance from Cromwell's army. He was at Westminster when the High Court of Justice sat in Westminster Hall to judge the King; and on the day after the sentence, when the troops were gathering in the cold January morning in the open space before Whitehall, and the King was holding his last conference with faithful Juxon; upon that 'black and eternally infamous day of the King's murder,' he tells us that he himself heard the King publicly prayed for in the school 'but an hour or two (at most) before his sacred head was struck off.'* It is commonly said that South himself read the prayers on that morning. He had all the love for his old school which a vigorous, hearty Englishman generally retains through life. Many years later, when South was a dignified Canon and Prebendary, a 'very great person'—no less a man than Lord Jefferys—planned a meeting of 'Old Westminsters,' and asked South to preach on the occasion in the Abbey. He had prepared the sermon from which we have just quoted, in which he lauds the school for training up 'her sons and scholars to an invincible loyalty to their Prince, and a strict, impartial conformity to the Church,' when the scheme was dropped on the death of Charles II. South, who was clearly disappointed that Jefferys 'thought fit as Chancellor to reverse what his Lordship as Chief Justice had determined,' printed the sermon which he had not himself been able to preach, thinking that 'possibly some other may condescend to do it, as before, in several such cases, the like has been too well known to have been done!'

The troubles of the time did not interrupt the even course of Westminster School. Some of the Independents did indeed suggest its suppression, as a hot-bed of Royalist principles, but Cromwell was too wise a man to condescend to petty persecution of this kind. South was elected to Christ Church in 1651, the year in which the hopes of the Stuarts were crushed for the time at the battle of Worcester. Oxford, at the time when South entered it, a boy of eighteen, had by no means shared the peaceful lot of Westminster. It had long been a centre of 'malignancy,' and scarcely a Head or a Professor had passed unscathed the scrutiny of the Parliamentary Commissioners. Cromwell himself was Chancellor; the Vice-Chancellor, for the greater part of South's undergraduateship, was the newly appointed Dean of Christ Church, Dr. John Owen, the coryphæus of the Independents; the same who shocked a poor bible-clerk of Merton, Anthony Wood, by 'going in quirpo like a young scholar, with powdred hair, snake-bone bandstrings (or bandstrings with very

* Sermon 'On the Education of Youth.'—(*Sermons*, ii. 300.)

large

large tassels), lawn band, a large set of ribbonds pointed at his knees, and Spanish leather boots with large lawn tops, and his hat mostly cocked.'* Probably this splendid array occasioned much the same kind of 'sensation' in the University, that the present excellent Vice-Chancellor would cause if he were to walk down 'the High' in a wide-awake and knicker-bockers. Owen, in spite of his voluminous theology, seems to have coveted lay distinction; for in 1654 he was a candidate for the representation of the University in Parliament, and was actually returned; but the House refused to recognise his renunciation of his orders—he had been regularly ordained—and the election was declared null and void. He does not appear, however, to have neglected his duty as Dean; he was a kindly and genial man, very anxious to encourage the scholars of his house, and Anthony Wood assures us that South won his favour. The stories related in the 'Memoirs' of the reciprocal annoyance practised by the Dean and the student do not appear worthy of much credit. The religious opinions of undergraduates were probably not much enquired into at this time by those in power; and South was not disposed, at any period of his life, to make needless difficulties about conforming to things as they were.

The principal records of South's life in Oxford from 1651 to the Restoration are the Latin works published after his death. Here are to be found the verses on Cromwell's treaty with the Dutch (1654) which were sometimes cast in South's teeth in after years; not quite fairly, perhaps, for he wrote on Cromwell's success, a theme probably prescribed by the authorities of his college, with just as much real feeling as he might have employed on the battle of Salamis, and in any case it would fare ill with the reputation of many distinguished men, if their youthful verses were to be admitted as proof of shameless inconsistency. His verses and declamations of this period are not of remarkable merit, and were never published by himself, with one exception, and that he in vain endeavoured to recall. The most amusing among them are the burlesque questions which he maintained as 'Terræ-Filius.' The 'Terræ-Filius' was the chartered libertine of the 'Public Act.' There was no limit to the license of his tongue. Taking for his text some harmless question—for instance 'whether ears or eyes are more useful for the acquisition of science?'—he filled his speech with pungent allusions to the

* Wood's 'Athenæ,' iv. 98. 'In quirpo' = in cuerpo (Spanish), *i.e.* in doublet and hose, without cloak or gown.

> 'Your Spanish host is never seen in *cuerpo*,
> Without his paramentos, cloke, and sword.'
>
> (*Ben Jonson*, 'New Inn,' ii. 5.)

peccadilloes

peccadilloes of conspicuous persons. This jovial solemnity was in fact not unlike 'the famous Saturnalian feasts among the Romans, when every scullion and skip-kennel had liberty to *tell his master his own*, as the *British* mobility emphatically stile it.'* A royalist 'Terræ-Filius' would no doubt take the opportunity of casting ridicule on Puritan heads of houses, and it is not wonderful that the authorities of South's time attempted to restrain the antique liberty. The Fescennine license of the Public Act was in fact under discussion in 1658, the year of the Protector's death.† The Terræ-Filius of course sometimes overstepped even the wide bounds allowed him, and felt the vengeance of the insulted Dons. For instance, about 1658, Mr. Lancelot Addison of Queen's, the father of the essayist, was compelled on his knees to implore the pardon of Convocation for the transgression of his tongue, and some years later Mr. H. Gerard of Wadham, for reciting a Terræ-Filius speech written by South himself, then a great dignitary of the University, was expelled. The wit of compositions of this kind is naturally, for the most part, evanescent; the covert allusions to the faults and peculiarities of the men of the time are no longer taken. South's jokes, at all events, have lost colour and flavour in two hundred years. It seems now rather a poor jest, when the Terræ-Filius declares himself inclined to believe the well-known theory that the moon is made of cheese, for he had observed it considerably diminished in bulk since the Cambridge men had been in Oxford! The point is lost of the suggestion (apropos of the device of 'Alma Mater Cantabrigia') that it was natural that Cambridge should adopt a *cup* among her emblems, when a Proctor sold beer, and therefore prevented students from entering taverns, not to spoil his own trade; nor is there much drollery in saying that Fuller's jokes were preserved in the archives at Cambridge and exhibited among the antiquities of the place; or in discussing the number of atoms that go to make up a Cambridge joke. But all these, though they have now grown stale, no doubt served their purpose, and raised a laugh in St Mary's—the Sheldonian Theatre as yet was not—when they were first uttered. The allusion to the cheese-devouring Cantabs was no doubt highly relished by those who had seen so many Cambridge men thrust into good berths at Oxford by the Parliamentary visitors, and beheld not a few Cambridge scholars among those who flocked to Oxford for preferment, of whose mortified countenances, puling voices, eyes

* Amhurst's 'Terræ-Filius,' No. 1. At the time that this book was published (1721) the 'Terræ-Filius' had not long been obsolete.

† Wood's 'History and Antiquities of Oxford,' ii. 670, &c.

lifted

lifted up, and short hair, Anthony Wood has left us so unpleasant a picture.*

South is said to have been ordained in 1658 by one of the deprived bishops;† though Wood, whom South had made his enemy by one of his rough jokes, declares that he preached in Oxford without orders.‡ However qualified, in 1659, while the question of the future government of England still hung in doubt, he preached the summer assize sermon at Oxford. The main purpose of the sermon is to recommend faithful endurance of persecution, if need should be, for the sake of Christ; but it is not difficult to discern in it the preacher's preference for the proscribed worship, the 'Common-prayer and surplice,' of the Church of England. 'If ever,' he says, 'it was seasonable to preach courage in the despised, abused cause of Christ, it is now, when his truths are reformed into nothing, when the hands and hearts of his faithful ministers are weakened, and even broke, and his *worship* extirpated in a mockery, that his *honour* may be advanced.'§ His sarcastic allusions to the Puritan ministry and worship were not obvious enough to afford a handle for his enemies, until he made them plain by notes when he published the sermon a few days before the restored King landed in England. When he preached before the King's Commissioners (July 29, 1660) there was no longer any need for disguise or ambiguity. He could frankly set forth his ideal of a Christian minister, and give full course to his contempt for the unlearned and fanatical teachers who had filled the pulpits during the late troublous times. On them he pours forth with eager delight the sarcastic mockery in which he so much excelled. He has no mercy for 'such mountebanks and quacks in divinity as have only two or three little experiments and popular harangues to amuse the vulgar with, but, being wholly unacquainted with the solid grounds and rules of science . . . . are pitifully ignorant and useless as to any great and worthy purposes; and fit for little else but to show the world how easily fools may be imposed upon by knaves.' These unlucky sectaries offended alike his judgment and his taste. Their barbarous style, their tendency to allegorise plain history, their numerous perplexing and artificial divisions, were abominations to one whose conceptions of oratory had been formed on Cicero and Quintilian. Those who use these quibbling divisions are, he says, 'wholly mistaken in the nature of wit; for true wit is a severe and manly thing. Wit in divinity is nothing else but sacred truths suitably ex-

* 'Fasti Oxon.,' 106 (Ed. Bliss).

† 'Posthumous Works,' p. 10.

‡ 'Athenæ Oxon.,' iv. 633.

§ 'Interest Deposed and Truth Restored.'—(*Sermons*, i. 52.)

pressed.

pressed.* It is not shreds of Latin or Greek, nor a *Deus Dixit* and a *Deus benedixit*, nor those little quirks or divisions into the ὅτι, the διότι, and the καθότι, or the *egress*, *regress*, and *progress*, and other such stuff (much like the style of a lease) that can properly be called *wit*. For that is not wit which consists not with wisdom.' And again he falls foul of the 'whimsical cant' of his old enemy John Owen, his *issues*, *products*, *tendencies*, *breathings*, *indwellings*, *rollings*, *recumbencies*. But his description of the method of Puritan preachers—a method even now not wholly extinct—in composing their sermons, is worth giving at length:—

'I hope it will not prove offensive to the auditory, if to release it (could I be so happy) from suffering by such stuff for the future, I venture upon some short description of it; and it is briefly thus:—First of all, they seize upon some text, from whence they draw something which they call a doctrine, and well may it be said to be *drawn* from the words: forasmuch as it seldom naturally flows or results from them. In the next place, being thus provided, they branch it into several heads; perhaps twenty, or thirty, or upwards. Whereupon, for the prosecution of these, they repair to some trusty concordance which never fails them, and by the help of that they range six or seven scriptures under each head; which scriptures they prosecute one by one, first amplifying and enlarging upon one for some considerable time, till they have spoiled it, and then that being done they pass to another, which in its turn suffers accordingly. And these impertinent and unpremeditated enlargements they look upon as the motions and breathings of the Spirit, and therefore much beyond those carnal ordinances of sense and reason, supported by industry and study; and this they call a *saving way* of preaching, as it must be confessed to be a way to save much labour, and nothing else that I know of.' †

And the gesture with which these tiresome discourses were delivered was as distasteful to him as the matter:—

'Can any tolerable reason be given for those strange new postures used by some in the delivery of the word? Such as shutting the eyes, distorting the face, and speaking through the nose, which I think cannot so properly be called preaching, as toning of a sermon. Nor do I see why the word may not be altogether as effectual for the conversion of souls, delivered by one who has the manners to look his auditory in the face, using his own countenance and his own native voice, without straining it to a lamentable and doleful whine, never serving to any purpose, but where some religious cheat is to be carried on.' ‡

---

* This exactly corresponds with Pope's conception:—

'True wit is Nature to advantage dressed,
What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed.'
(*Essay on Criticism*, vv. 297-8.)

† 'The Scribe Instructed.'—(*Sermons*, ii. 82.)

‡ Ibid., p. 83.

South's

South's scorn for the unlearned persons who had crept into the ministry during the Commonwealth breaks forth indeed repeatedly in his earlier sermons, not always in the most decorous style. For instance, in the sermon on 'Ecclesiastical Policy,' he tells us that a short time before—

'Many rushed into the ministry as being the only calling they could profess without serving an apprenticeship. . . . Had, indeed, the old Levitical hierarchy still continued, in which it was part of the ministerial office to flay the sacrifices, to cleanse the vessels, to scour the flesh-forks, to sweep the Temple, and carry the filth and rubbish to the brook Kidron, no persons living had been better fitted for the ministry, and to serve in this nature at the altar. But since it is made a labour of the mind, as to inform men's judgments and move their affections, to resolve difficult places of scripture, to decide and clear off controversies, I cannot see how to be a butcher, scavenger, or any such trade, does at all qualify or prepare men for this work. . . . We have had almost all sermons full of gibes and scoffs at human learning. . . . . Hereupon the ignorant have taken heart to venture upon this great calling, and instead of cutting their way to it, according to the usual course—through the knowledge of the tongues, the study of philosophy, school divinity, the fathers and councils—they have taken another and shorter cut, and having read perhaps a treatise or two upon the Heart, the Bruised Reed, the Crumbs of Comfort, Wollebius in English, and some other little authors, the usual furniture of old women's closets, they have set forth as accomplished divines, and forthwith they present themselves to the service; and there have not been wanting Jeroboams as willing to consecrate and receive them, as they to offer themselves.' *

We can well believe (as the author of his memoirs tells us was the case) that the preacher was 'highly applauded for many excellent and sarcastical expressions against the sectarists late in power.' The restored Royalists must have been indeed gentle and forbearing if they had not enjoyed the dissection of their late triumphant adversaries by the hand of so great a master of moral anatomy. They did, in fact, not only applaud but reward their champion. Preferment was showered on the successful satirist. A few weeks after the Restoration he was made Public Orator of Oxford; before he was forty he was a Canon of Christ Church and Prebendary of Westminster; and about 1677 the latter Chapter conferred on him the rectory of Islip. He had besides a patrimonial estate. The older men who had suffered for the royal cause not unnaturally murmured at this rapid preferment of a young divine who was in no need and had suffered nothing. Many cavaliers, both lay and clerical, had reason to

* 'Sermons,' i. 67.

complain

complain of the little consideration accorded to their losses and services. As South himself said, in his characteristic manner, many years afterwards, 'if a man's loyalty has stripped him of his estate, his interest, or relations, then, like the lame man at the pool of Bethesda, every one steps in before him.' *

Few University orators have had such occasions for displaying their powers of panegyric as fell to the lot of South. In 1661 Clarendon was installed as Chancellor, and the young orator had to address him in the usual complimentary speech. But a few days afterwards a deputation came down to Oxford from the House of Commons to thank the academies for their exemplary loyalty to the King during the late rebellion, and specially for their victorious arguments against the solemn league and covenant; it fell to South's lot to thank the honourable gentlemen for descending from the study of princes and kingdoms and the secrets of empire to the bookish haunts of the University. In July, 1663, the body of the venerable Juxon, Archbishop of Canterbury, was solemnly buried in the chapel of his old College, St. John's, and the mortal remains of the once President, William Laud, Juxon's old friend and patron, were brought from their resting-place in Allhallows, Barking, and laid by his side. The Public Orator celebrated the double obsequies, as was fitting, with an oration in the Divinity School. In September of the same year he offered the greetings of the University to the King and Queen, who paid a visit to faithful Oxford, and presented for an 'ad eundem' degree James Duke of Monmouth, already an M.A. of Cambridge. In July, 1664, was laid the foundation of the Sheldonian Theatre, with an accompanying oration from South, who professed himself glad to be in the midst of building, after an age of 'reforming' and pulling down. Standing in the midst of the chaos of building-materials, he was reminded—an orator of our days would hardly have ventured on such a reminiscence—of the beginning of the world. He rejoiced that the jocose orations and plays which had desecrated St. Mary's were to be removed to the more fitting scene of a theatre. Alluding to the press, which was to form part of the new building, he hopes that Oxford will soon surpass Leyden as much in printing as she did already in writing; hardly a justifiable sneer at the University of Grotius and Vossius. When the theatre was opened in 1669 South again discharged the office of Orator, in a speech filled with satirical invectives against Cromwell, the fanatics, conventicles, comprehension, the Royal Society, and the new philosophy, greatly to the disgust of Dr. Wallis, the distin-

* 'Sermons,' ii. 436.

guished

guished Savilian Professor.* This speech is not printed; but if the invectives in any degree resembled those which South put into the mouth of the Terræ-Filius of 1671, in which Wallis is especially attacked, they must have been very unbefitting the solemnity of the occasion.

James, Duke of York, who 'gained the title of *Dux*, not only by right of birth, but by the actual conduct of fleets and armies;' William Henry, Prince of Orange, 'sprung on the father's side from the warlike Princes of Nassau, on the mother's from the peaceful James;' Cosmo de Medicis, Prince of Tuscany, 'kinsman and friend of King Charles,' who travelled in England in 1675, were among the noble persons whom the Orator had to bedew with official praise. And, on the whole, he discharged his difficult duty well. But he was not a first-rate Latinist. His orations are, indeed, correct, and fairly idiomatic; but he has not that mastery of expression which results from thinking in Latin; the jokes, which in his expressive English would have flashed out in full force, are very much hampered by the stately folds of the dead language; his conceits savour of English; he has neither the charming archness of Erasmus, nor the classic ease of Muretus; his style is far less truly Roman than that of one of the best Latin writers of later years, John Keble. It was, indeed, hardly to be expected that one whose thoughts flowed so readily into vigorous expression in the vernacular should have equal command of the language of scholars.

The even current of his days was broken by one long journey on the continent of Europe. In 1674 John Sobieski was elected king of the troubled realm of Poland. Mr. Lawrence Hyde, afterwards Earl of Rochester, who was sent as Ambassador Extraordinary to compliment the new King on his accession, proposed to take his old tutor, Dr. South, with him in the capacity of Chaplain: a proposal, says his biographer, 'which the Doctor very readily agreed to, being of a very curious and inquisitive temper, and desirous of being an eye-witness of the posture of affairs in other countries as well as his own.'† He gave an account of what he had learned on his travels in a letter addressed to his 'best friend and honoured instructor,' Edward Pocock, then Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. It appears that Mr. Hyde did not set forth on his mission until June, 1677, and in December of that year Dr. South wrote his letter from Dantzic. He had certainly travelled with his eyes open, and what he had seen and learned he

* Wallis to Boyle, in Boyle's Works, v. 514.
† 'Posthumous Works,' p. 20.

 relates

relates well and succinctly in his letter; a letter which must have occupied a considerable space in the letter-bag of the embassy. The King received them at Zolkiew in Galicia. It is worth while to see what manner of man the afterwards deliverer of Vienna appeared to the shrewd Oxford Doctor:—

'This King is a very well-spoken Prince, very easy of access, and extream civil, having most of the qualities requisite to form a compleat gentleman. He is not only well versed in all military affairs, but likewise, through the means of a French education, very opulently stored with all polite and scholastical learning. Besides his own tongue, the Sclavonian, he understands the Latin, French, Italian, German, and Turkish languages. He delights much in Natural History and in all the parts of physick; he is wont to reprimand the Clergy for not admitting the modern philosophy, such as Le Grand's and Cartesius's, into the universities and schools; and loves to hear people discourse of those matters, and has a particular talent to set people about him very artfully by the ears, that by their disputes he might be directed, as it happed once or twice during this embassy; where he shewed a poignancy of wit on the subject of a dispute held between the Bishop of Posen and Father de la Motte, a Jesuit, and His Majesty's confessor, that gave me an extraordinary opinion of his parts. As for what relates to His Majesty's person, he is a tall and corpulent Prince, large faced and full eyes, and goes always in the same dress with his subjects, with his hair cut round about his ears like a monk, and wears a furr-cap, but extraordinary rich with diamonds and jewels, large whiskers, and no neckcloth. A long robe hangs down to his heels, in the fashion of a coat, and a waistcoat under that of the same length, tied about the waste with a girdle. He never wears any gloves, and this long coat is of strong scarlet cloth, lined in the winter with rich furr, but in summer only with silk. Instead of shoes he always wears, both abroad and at home, Turkey leather boots with very thin soles, and hollow deep heels made of a blade of silver bent hollowwise into the form of a half-moon. He carries always a large scymitar by his side, the sheath equally flat and broad from the handle to the bottom and curiously set with diamonds.' *

South seems to have formed no high opinion of the state of Theology among the Poles. He admits, indeed, that they were good Latinists; but the lifeless scholasticism, which elsewhere in Europe was yielding to the 'new philosophy,' was still in full possession of the Polish Universities. It was something new to a divine fresh from Oxford to find Albertus Magnus still in the highest esteem, and entities, modes, quiddities, essences, and the like, interlarded in common conversation, while the Bible was scarcely opened, and the history of primitive Christianity, the

* 'Posthumous Works,' p. 84.

battle-field

battle-field of so many English combatants, was almost unknown.* Nor do the lives of the clergy, at least of the regular clergy, seem to have inspired him with more respect than their studies. These regulars, he says, 'are generally very rich, but not less dissolute and immodest; for they frequently go into the cellars to drink, those being the tippling-places in this country; and sometimes you shall see many of them so drunk in the streets, that they are scarce able to stand or go; and this without either their superiors or the people taking notice of them.'† He clearly discerned, too, the unhappy defects in the constitution of Poland, which effectually prevented the formation of a strong Government, and ultimately caused the ruin of the kingdom.

After his return to England, South seems to have passed his prosperous life at one of his benefices, or on his patrimonial estate; hungering for yet further advancement, said his enemies; content with a private station, though he might have enjoyed the highest dignities, said his friends. On one occasion in particular Charles II. is said to have marked him for a bishopric. In 1681, the story goes, South preached before the King on 'The Lot cast into the Lap.' Speaking of the 'slippery turns' of the world, he said:—

'Who, that had looked upon Agathocles first handling the clay, and making pots under his father, and afterwards turning robber, could have thought that from such a condition he should come to be King of Sicily?

'Who, that had seen Massaniello, a poor fisherman, with his red cap and his angle, could have reckoned it possible to see such a pitiful thing, within a week after, shining in his cloth of gold, and with a word or a nod absolutely commanding the whole city of Naples?

'And who, that had beheld such a bankrupt, beggarly fellow as Cromwell, first entering the Parliament-house with a threadbare, torn cloak and a greasy hat (and perhaps neither of them paid for), could have suspected that in the space of so few years he should, by the murder of one King and the banishment of another, ascend the throne, be invested with the royal robes, and want nothing of the state of a King but the changing of his hat into a crown?'‡

At these words, it is said, the King fell into a violent fit of laughter, and, turning to Lord Rochester, said, 'Ods fish, Lory, your chaplain must be a bishop, therefore put me in mind of him at the next death.' The saying is at least 'ben trovato;' but the Sermon, which was one of those published by South himself, is said in the superscription to have been 'Preached in Westminster Abbey, Feb. 22, 1684-(5);' some days, that is, after

* 'Posthumous Works,' pp. 37, 38. † Ibid., p. 69. ‡ 'Sermons,' i. 128.

Charles's death. Whatever be the foundation of this story, it is not to be regretted that Charles's purpose, if ever conceived, was not carried out; for South's keen wit and satirical turn would certainly not have tended to heal the dissensions of the church. He remained to the end of his days, simply the favourite preacher of the 'old cavaliers.'* Those who followed Lawrence Hyde as a political leader flocked to the sermons of his famous chaplain. He preached, for the most part, at Oxford, at Westminster Abbey, or before the Court at Whitehall; occasionally he delivered a discourse at the consecration of a bishop or of a chapel; of his parish sermons at Islip, if he delivered any, we have no record, though of course some of the published sermons may have been delivered there, and they are at least as suitable for a country audience as the standard 'discourses' of the last century.

But if South was the favourite preacher of the cavaliers, it was not because he flattered their vices. His turns of phrase might remind them of the stage and the coffee-house, his wit and satire might be not unworthy of Dryden or Congreve, but his morality had the manly vigour of the antique world in the midst of which he was born. He was no Bourdaloue or Massillon to rebuke the vices of a king; but he did not spare the darling abominations of the royalist party in general. Their frivolity, their licentiousness, their false sense of honour, alike offended him; he painted the bullies and rufflers of Charles II.'s days with hardly less gusto than he had done the Puritans. He pitches upon the year sixty, the year of the Restoration, as 'the grand epoch of falsehood, as well as debauchery.'† And he satirizes the shameless vice and frivolity of the age in the following passage:—

'For in respect of vice, nothing is more usual now-a-days than for boys *illico nasci senes*. They see their betters delight in ill things; they observe reputation and countenance to attend the practice of them; and this carries them on furiously to that which of themselves they are but too much inclined to; and which laws were purposely made by wise men to keep them from. They are glad, you may be sure, to please and prefer themselves at once, and to serve their interest and sensuality together.

'And as they are come to this height and rampancy of vice, in a great measure, from the countenance of their betters and superiors, so they have taken some steps higher in the same from this, that the follies and extravagances of the young too frequently carry with them the suffrage and approbation of the old. For age, which naturally and unavoidably is but one remove from death, and consequently should have nothing about it but what looks like a decent preparation

* South's own term. 'Sermons,' i. 164. † Ibid., i. 201.

for

for it, scarce ever appears of late days but in the high mode, the flaunting garb, and utmost gaudery of youth; with clothes as ridiculous, and as much in the fashion, as the person that wears them is actually grown out of it. The eldest equal the youngest in the vanity of their dress, and no other reason can be given of it but that they equal, if not surpass them in the vanity of their desires.' *

And where shall we find the swash-buckler style of the tavern-haunters of that day more vigorously sketched than in the following passage:—

'Honour is indeed a noble thing, and therefore the word which signifies it must needs be very plausible. But as a rich and glistening garment may be cast over a rotten, fashionably diseased body, so an illustrious, commanding word may be put upon a vile and an ugly thing; for words are but the garments, the loose garments of things, and so may easily be put off and on, according to the humour of him who bestows them. But the body changes not, though the garments do.

'What is honour but the height and flower and top of morality, and the utmost refinement of conversation?

* * * * * * *

and yet in spite of nature and reason, and the judgment of all mankind, this high and generous thing must be that in whose pretended quarrel almost all the duels of the world are fought. "Ah! my honour is concerned," says one. "In what, I pray?" "Why, he gave me the lie." "That is, he gave you what perhaps was your own before. But as truth cannot be made falsehood by the work of tongues, so neither can a liar be made a true man by forcing a coward to eat his words, or a murderer become an honest man by a lucky (or rather unlucky) thrust of a lawless sword." "Ay, but he spoke slightly and reflexively of such a lady." That is, perhaps he treated her without a compliment, and spoke that of her which she had rather a great deal practise than hear or be told of. In short, he might represent her in her true colours; and surely there is no reason that such should be always their own painters, and, while they live by one measure, describe them by another. What right have the votaries, or rather slaves, of pleasure to wear the badge and livery of strict and severe virtue?' †

And his characteristics of the 'good-natured man,' as he appears to various classes of society, is not unworthy of La Bruyére for vigorous delineation, though it must be confessed that it wants his delicacy of satire.

'And first, when great ones vouchsafe this elogy to those below them, a good-natured man generally denotes some slavish, glavering, flattering parasite or hanger-on, one who is a mere tool or instrument, a fellow fit to be sent on any malicious errand; a setter or informer, made to creep into all companies; a wretch employed under a pretence

* 'Sermons,' ii. 301. † Ibid., iii. 3.

of

of friendship or acquaintance to fetch and carry, and to come to men's tables to play the Judas there; and, in a word, to do all those mean, vile, and degenerous offices, which men of greatness and malice use to engage men of baseness and treachery in.

'But then, on the other hand, when this word passes between equals, commonly by a good-natured man is meant, either some easy, soft-headed piece of simplicity, who suffers himself to be led by the nose, and wiped of his conveniences by a company of sharping worthless sycophants, who will be sure to despise, laugh, and droll at him, as a weak, empty fellow, for all his ill-placed cost and kindness.

'And the truth is, if such vermin do not find him empty, it is odds but in a little time they will make him so. And this is one branch of that which some call good-nature (and good-nature let it be), indeed so good, that, according to the wise Italian proverb, "it is even good for nothing."

'Or, in the next place, by a good-natured man is usually meant neither more nor less than a good fellow, a painful, able, and laborious soaker. But he who owes all his good-nature to the pot and the pipe, to the jollity and compliances of merry company, may possibly go to bed with a wonderful stock of good-nature over-night, but then he will sleep it all away before the morning.' *

The leading incidents of Charles II.'s reign receive less notice in South's Sermons than we should have expected from his keen interest in politics, and his readiness in allusion to current events. It is evident enough that he heartily approved the 'oath of non-resistance' to the kingly power; he seems to have thought that the Government which passed and enforced the Conventicle Act, the Five-mile Act, and the Test Act, was rather to be censured for leniency than severity; and the outcry, in the reigns of Charles I. and his sons, against arbitrary power seemed to him mere factious virulence.† The 'Popish Plot,' the Exclusion Bill, the 'two famous city cavalcades of clubmen in 1679 and 1680,' and the Rye House Plot, have left but little trace on his pages.‡ James succeeded his brother and avowed himself a Papist; South declared that if any branch of the Royal Family had unhappily drunk in any of the Popish contagion, they were to blame who had driven them 'from the bosom of the best father and firmest Protestant in the world, and sent them into foreign countries,' amid all the seductions of Roman teaching and ritual.§ A Roman Catholic took possession of the Deanery of Christ Church, another was placed in the see of Oxford; but South never attacked John Massey and Samuel Parker as he had done John Owen and the Westminster divines;

* 'Sermons,' iii. pp. 10, 11.

† Ibid., ii. 523 *ff.*

‡ These are *mentioned* in the beginning of the Westminster School Sermon.—(*Sermons*, ii. 281.)

§ 'Sermons,' ii. 509.

nor

nor do we recollect any allusion to James's famous attack on Magdalen College. When Rochester proposed South as one of the Anglican champions in the discussion which the King had agreed to hear on the 'Rule of Faith,' James rejected him, on the ground that he would bring 'railing accusations' instead of arguments. That he would have railed is likely enough, but he was not deficient in power of argument, and is said to have given much assistance to the divines ultimately chosen to maintain the cause of the Church of England, Jane and Patrick.* The 'Declaration of Indulgence' must have been in the highest degree distasteful to him, for the whole bent of his mind was intolerant, and he hated Papists almost as much as Puritans; but his sense of duty to his Sovereign probably restrained, if not the expression, at least the publication of his disgust. In a sermon preached (seemingly) in James's reign he expresses his scorn for those 'rattling, rabble-charming words,' 'arbitrary power,' 'evil counsellors,' 'public spirits, patriots, and standers up for their country,' 'zeal for liberty and property, and the rights of the subject,' 'used and applied by some state-impostors, as Scripture was once quoted by the devil;'† nor can he tolerate the 'cant and gibberish' of calling the schismatical deserters of the Church of England 'true Protestants;' the execution of the law in behalf of the Church 'persecution;' and all base trimming compliances and half-conformity 'moderation,' by the 'senseless insignificant clink and sound' of which words (he says) 'some restless demagogues and incendiaries had inflamed the minds of the sottish *mobile* to a strange unaccountable abhorrence of the best of men and things, and to a fond and furious admiration of the very worst.' It is easy to see that South did not find his 'best of men and things' on the side of the constitutional party. But he was not fond of committing himself; three of his published Sermons were preached in the critical year 1688; the last of them at Westminster Abbey on that very November 5th when William of Orange was landing at Torbay, and London was all astir with preparations to oppose him; yet the political allusions in these sermons are unusually obscure, though when the preacher speaks of the deliverance of 1588, 'when the seas and the winds had a command from heaven to fight under the English colours,' we may not unreasonably conjecture that he was hoping for a similar discomfiture of William's armada.

South acquiesced in the transfer of the Crown to William and

* Memoir in Posthumous Works, p. 111. Lord Macaulay does not appear to have included this Memoir among the sources whence he derived his account of the discussion.—(*Works*, vol. i. p. 638.)

† 'Sermons,' iii. 3.

Mary;

Mary; but in criticising the measures of the new government he no longer observed the caution which he had thought prudent under James. The proposed Comprehension and Toleration brought out all the fiery invective with which he had attacked the Puritans thirty years before. In one of his most vigorous sermons, which bears internal evidence of having been preached in the early part of William's reign,* he exhorts the friends of the Church of England to 'give no place by subjection, no, not for an hour,' to those who desired concessions to be made to the non-conformists. He has no longer any scruple about denouncing King James's Declaration, when he can make the Popish tendency of his Indulgence an argument against the proposed toleration. 'Can we believe,' he asks, 'that his design was to keep out Popery? No, surely; for such as believe even transubstantiation itself cannot believe this. So that let all our separatists and dissenters know that they are but the Pope's journeymen to carry on his work; and for ought I know, were but King James among us, might be treated together with his nuncio at Guildhall.' With regard to the ceremonies, he takes much the same ground that Hooker had taken against the Puritans of Elizabeth's time; then he reproaches the Presbyterians with their own intolerance of the 'Baal-priests' of the Church of England in their days of prosperity. There was already enough irregularity in the Church. Already they had seen—

'The surplice sometimes worn, and oftener laid aside; the liturgy so read, and mangled in the reading, as if they were ashamed of it; the divine service so curtailed, as if the people were to have but the tenths of it from the priest, for the tenths he had received from them. The clerical habit neglected by such in orders as frequently travel the road clothed like farmers or graziers, to the unspeakable shame and scandal of their profession; the holy sacrament indecently or slovenly administered; the furniture of the altar abused and embezzled; and the table of the Lord profaned. These and the like vile passages have made some schismatics, and confirmed others; and in a word have made so many nonconformists to the church by their conforming to their minister.' †

But the irregularity already existing would be enormously increased by the proposed Comprehension:—

'Then will it also follow that in the same diocese, and sometimes in the very same town, some shall use the surplice and some shall

* Beside the internal evidence, this Sermon was described as 'a Sermon Preached at the close of the last century,' when it was published in a pamphlet form in 1716. It is on Gal. ii. 5, was printed (by South) in the 5th volume of his Sermons, and again (from another copy) in the Posthumous Works.—(*Sermons*, ii. 476; iv. 507.)

† 'Sermons,' ii. 493.

not;

not; and each shall have their parties prosecuting one another with the bitterest hatreds and animosities. Some in the same church, and at the same time, shall receive the sacrament kneeling, some standing, and others possibly sitting; some shall use the cross in baptism, and others shall not only not use it themselves, but shall also inveigh and preach against those who do. Some shall read this part of the Common Prayer, some that, and some perhaps none at all. And where (as in cathedrals) they cannot avoid the hearing it read by others, they shall come into the church when it is done, and stepping up into the pulpit (with great gravity no doubt) shall conceive a long, crude, extemporary prayer, in reproach of all the prayers which the church, with such admirable prudence and devotion had been making before. Nay, in the same cathedral you shall see one prebendary in a surplice, another in a long cloak, another in a short coat or jacket; and in the performance of the public service some standing up at the Creed, the *Gloria Patri*, and the reading of the Gospel; and others sitting, and perhaps laughing, and winking upon their fellow schismatics, in scoff of those who practise these decent orders of the Church. And from hence the mischief shall pass from priest to people, dividing them also into irreconcilable parties and factions, so that some shall come to church when such a one preaches, and absent themselves when another does. "I will not hear this formalist," says one; "and I will not hear this schismatic" (with better reason) says another. But in the meanwhile the Church by these horrible disorders is torn in pieces, and the common enemies of it the papists, and some (who hate it as much) gratified.'*

The Comprehension which South dreaded never came to pass; and few will doubt that it is well for the Church of England that it failed.

Early in the reign of William, South engaged in the great controversy of his life, that with William Sherlock, the Dean of St. Paul's. In the days of William and Mary, Sherlock was perhaps the best abused man in England. So far back as 1674, his 'Discourse concerning the Knowledge of Jesus Christ' —a work in which he certainly spoke in unbecoming terms of one of the deepest Christian mysteries—had given great offence to many, and there seems to have been a talk of censuring it in Convocation. But this odium theologicum was as nothing compared with the storm of mingled theologic and political rancour which was roused by his conduct at the time of the Revolution. After declining to take the oath of allegiance to the new Sovereign he had been suddenly and most opportunely converted, by the perusal of Bishop Overall's 'Convocation Book,' into an adherent of the existing Government, had been reinstated in his Master-

* 'Sermons,' ii. 485.

ship

ship of the Temple, and ultimately preferred to the Deanery of St. Paul's. South, who had himself conformed, could not with a good grace attack Sherlock for his defence of allegiance to the actually existing sovereign power, though he probably looked upon him with no favourable eye; but the Dean gave him an opening of which he was not slow to avail himself. The Socinian controversy was then active in England, and Sherlock contributed to it 'A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity.' The intention of the work was excellent; to show that there is nothing in the doctrine of the Trinity, duly apprehended, contradictory to right reason. The Dean (who, though little younger than South, belonged to a much more modern school of thought), saw clearly that the retention of the terms of scholastic theology led to constant ambiguities and misapprehensions in an age when men's minds were no longer formed by scholastic training: it was not well to retain the phrases of Duns and Aquinas in the days of Descartes and Locke. He believed that it would be possible to state the doctrine of the Trinity clearly and unambiguously, without departing from the faith, in terms of the new philosophy. But nothing could be more unfortunate than his attempt at a restatement. His terminology was liable to all the objections which attached to the old scholasticism, while it was extremely doubtful whether it could be reconciled with the universal belief of the Church. His description of the three Persons of the Divine Tri-unity as 'Three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits,' having 'self-consciousness and mutual-consciousness,' was decried on all hands as tritheistic. Those who disliked Sherlock, and they were many, seized the opportunity to take a fling at the unlucky controversialist. South, in particular, fastened on the book with eager animosity; nowhere do we find more striking specimens of his irony and sarcasm than in the 'Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book' on the Trinity, 'humbly offered to his admirers, and to himself the chief of them, by a Divine of the Church of England.' This tract was published anonymously, but no one seems to have doubted for an instant that it proceeded from South's pen; many theologians of that day might have supplied the learning and the philosophy, but no other than South could have produced that bright style and vigorous invective. A few years later, it might have passed for Swift's; but Swift was as yet an almost unknown young man. The very first sentences of the preface reveal the animus of the book. 'It had been to be wished,' says the Divine, 'and (one would think) might very reasonably have been expected, that, when Providence had took the work of destroying the Church of England out of the Papists' hands, some would have been contented with her

preferments,

preferments, without either attempting to give up her Rites and Liturgy, or deserting her doctrine. But it has proved much otherwise.'* . . . 'I can hardly believe my eyes, while I read such a pettit novellist charging the whole Church as fools and heretics, for not subscribing to a silly heretical notion solely of his own invention.' . . . 'Was it the school, the University, or Gravel Lane, that taught him this language?' † In a word, South devoted all his remarkable powers to the congenial task of demolishing the renegade Dean. He has no difficulty in showing that the Doctor was very ill qualified to become a second Athanasius; that his pet definition was not to be reconciled with the decrees of Councils, the opinions of Fathers, the conclusions of Schoolmen; but he is not content with this. He expresses at every turn his contempt for his opponent; he refuses him his style of 'Very Reverend,' for he says that he neither *reverences* nor fears him. He is not satisfied with refuting the main position of the book; he stands over it and tears it to pieces with the most hearty good will. He falls foul of the Dean's style, his orthography, the very errors of the press; and it is not a little diverting to find South, of whose manner we have seen some specimens, and who himself writes 'pre*h*eminence' and '*w*reaking with blood,' rating Sherlock's temper and 'insolent way of writing,' and criticising his 'prosopopœa,' 'Quad*r*igesimal,' and 'epith*i*te.'‡ Nay, he cannot refrain from hinting a doubt of Sherlock's perfect happiness in the society of his somewhat imperious spouse, under the guise of an illustration derived from Socrates and Xanthippe; a kind of allusion which the poor Dean had often to endure.

Sherlock was not, however, so far put to confusion but that he published a 'Defence' against his 'Animadverter,' to which South rejoined (still anonymously) in his 'Tritheism charged upon Dr. Sherlock's new notion of the Trinity,' a work which at any rate proves that its author's style had lost none of its vigour, and which was received with a burst of applause from churchmen of the older school. The lay public took a keen, if sometimes cynical, interest in the discussion; substance and hypostasis, self-consciousness and mutual-consciousness became the talk of the coffee-houses; and the Dean and the Prebendary, with Burnet of the Charter-house (who had just shocked the world by his

* 'Animadversions,' p. 1. Sherlock was not one of the Commissioners for the revision of the Liturgy in 1689, however he may have deserted the *doctrine* of the Church of England.

† 'Animadversions,' p. 3. Gravel Lane is a narrow street near Bankside; then, and probably now, an academy of bad language.

‡ 'Animadversions,' pp. 336, 337, 442.

'Archæologia'), were hitched into a doggrel rhyme, which hinted that religion, affrighted at so much noise, had taken her flight hence. In the end, this profane bandying about of the fundamental doctrines of our faith was found so far from edifying, that the King himself attempted to put an end to the controversy, by an injunction addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops, to the effect, that no preacher whatsoever, in his sermon or lecture, should presume to deliver any other doctrine concerning the blessed Trinity than what was contained in the Holy Scriptures, and was agreeable to the three Creeds, and the thirty-nine Articles of Religion.* It is difficult to conceive what effect this well-intentioned document could have had, for both the combatants claimed to be in harmony with the mind of the Church; nevertheless, this declaration that contests of this kind were displeasing to those in power does seem to have sufficed to put an end to the outward manifestations of debate. Even after this, however, South could not refrain from a fling at Stillingfleet,† who had inclined to Sherlock's side, and had deprecated these intemperate quarrels of authors.

There remains little more to tell of South's life. He continued to preach at least until the end of the century, but probably his popularity waned as the public taste came to prefer the smoother preachers of the age of Queen Anne. One of the last acts recorded of him is his unwearied solicitation of certain Peers on behalf of Dr. Sacheverell.‡ Almost dying, he was carried in a chair to vote, at an election of High-Steward of Westminster, for the Earl of Arran, brother of the attainted Duke of Ormond.§ He died on the 8th of July, 1716, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. Atterbury was then Dean; Pope had some time before published the 'Essay on Criticism' and the 'Rape of the Lock;' the 'Tatler,' 'Spectator,' and 'Guardian' had found their way into every coffee-house and boudoir; and St. John had thought that Dr. South's stall would be an acceptable piece of preferment for his friend Dr. Swift. Perhaps no period of eighty years had brought a greater change in English literature and English modes of thought than the eighty years of South's life.

South fairly realised his own ideal of the Gospel scribe, as depicted in one of his most famous sermons. As the householder, he says:—

'If a man of substance and sufficiency, of a large stock and as large a mind, will entertain his friends and guests with plenty and variety of provision, answerable to the difference of men's palates, as well as

* Given in Cardwell's 'Documentary Annals,' ii. 389. Dated Feb. 3, 1695.

† In a Dedication to Narcissus Boyle (1698), Archbishop of Dublin.—(*Sermons*, i. 401.)

‡ 'Posthumous Works,' 137.

§ Ibid., 139.

to

to the difference of the season; not confining them to the same standing common fare, but, as occasion requires, adding something of more cost and rarity besides; so our gospel scribe, or preacher, in the entertainment of his spiritual guests, is not always to set before them only the main substantials of religion, whether for belief or practice, but as the matter shall require, to add also illustration to the one and enforcement to the other, sometimes persuading, sometimes terrifying; and accordingly addressing himself to the afflicted and desponding with gospel lenitives, and to the hard and obstinate with legal corrosives; and since the relish of all is not the same, he is to apply to the vulgar with plain familiar similitudes, and to the learned with greater choiceness of language and closeness of argument; and, moreover, since every age of the Church more peculiarly needs the clearer discussion of some truth or other, then more particularly doubted of or opposed; therefore to the inculcating the general acknowledged points of Christianity, he is to add something of the controversies, opinions, and vices of the times; otherwise he cannot reach men's minds and inclinations, which are apt to be argued this way or that way, according to different times and occasions; and, consequently, he falls so far short of a good orator, and much more of an accurate preacher.'*

This is sound and dignified. We should be greatly mistaken if we were to imagine, from the specimens we have seen of South's wit and irony, that he was a mere pulpit-buffoon. Far from it, he was a man of unusual ability and acquirements, both as a scholar and a theologian. He never lost the flavour of philosophy with which he had been imbued when young at Oxford; he studied divinity thoroughly after the manner of his time, and divinity was then a perfectly definite study. Theological theses were drawn with a precision which an equity-draughtsman might envy, and very few theologians of our day could imitate. Most of the doubts and questionings which tend to give a certain vagueness of outline to the teaching of our own days had in the seventeenth century no existence. Differences of doctrine there were in abundance; but certain premisses were assumed on all sides, and the same kind of logical training was —at least in the early part of the century—general throughout Europe. Controversialists could at least understand each other, and oppose argument to argument, syllogism to syllogism. Roman, Anglican, Lutheran, Calvinist, and Socinian divines were mutually intelligible. Their armour might be burdensome, but the combatants met with a fair shock in the lists, and lances were generally broken, even if neither was overthrown. Definiteness is one of the most marked characteristics of the seventeenth-

* 'The Scribe Instructed.'—(*Sermons*, ii. 67.)

century

century theology. And South belongs entirely to the early part of the seventeenth century in his theology; he has no glimpses of the shadowy world which has opened before men's eyes since the days of Kant and Hegel; in his system, all is hard and firm. He was not probably very learned in the fathers, but he knew thoroughly the principal 'Systems' and 'Loci Theologici' of his time, which resulted from the old scholasticism after it had passed through the alembic of the Reformation. The 'points' of the Romish, Socinian, and Predestinarian controversies, the questions of Church government discussed between Independent, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian, were familiar to him, and his arguments, in a limited range, are clear and cogent. And if we think his expressions against his theological opponents unbecomingly harsh, we must remember, that questions of Church government could not be discussed calmly by men who believed that Presbyterianism had caused the great Rebellion, and Independency the murder of the King, and suspected that the Pope had aided and abetted both. His theology has no doubts; he has no hesitation with regard to his own belief, and as little in condemning his opponents. He was not the man to pay respect, with gentle Henry More, to every man's religion; he felt himself to be in the right, and kept no terms with those who were in the wrong. It was not for him, it was hardly for his age, to see in the earnest mysticism of men like George Fox more than the brain-sick aberrations of a madman. The fanatics of Münster and the sober Independents of England are swept in one universal censure. And, strange as it may seem, this puritan-hating divine was a Predestinarian; or rather, as he would probably have preferred to be called, an Augustinian. True, he taught that 'the universal light which we usually term the light of nature' might also be rightly termed 'the light of the spirit,' a breadth of doctrine certainly much beyond popular Calvinism; yet, he clearly taught that the workings of the spirit for the conversion of sinners 'are not resistible, inasmuch as they take away our resistance;' the 'effectual converting power . . . in its addresses to the soul is irresistible; it does not persuade, but overpower,'* and this irresistible force of divine grace was the very turning-point of the contest between Calvinists and Arminians. Moreover, he rarely speaks with respect of the Dutch divines who followed Arminius, while he classes Calvin, in spite of his republican opinions, with Erasmus, Melancthon, Politian, and Budæus, as one of the restorers of 'polite learning.'† He was thoroughly anti-Pelagian; but he was very much more conscious

* 'Sermons,' iv. 452, 460. † Ibid., ii. 331.

of

of the deep mystery which veils the working of God's will on man's will than most of his contemporaries.

And he was a sound and careful scholar of the ante-Bentleian school. He read his Greek Testament to much more purpose than most of the divines between his time and our own; and he discusses difficult passages with constant reference to the original text, with a thorough knowledge of the standard authorities of his time, and with unfailing good sense. Hence we never find him, like too many of his contemporaries, preaching on texts which have no relation to the subject in hand, or misled by an ambiguous word in the English translation. Or if he does occasionally take a text which is a mere motto, he frankly admits that he refers it to his subject by 'accommodation.' With his somewhat hard and realistic mind, he hated the far-fetched expositions of Scripture in which some of his contemporaries so much delighted; for himself, he did not profess to 'wire-draw the sense of a place,' so as to make it speak whatever he pleased; 'as some who can interpret Scripture, as if the whole Book of God was only to tell things transacted in England and Scotland, so that there cannot be so much as a house fired, or a leg broken, but they can find it in Daniel or the Revelations.'* Was there, he asks, in a sermon on the martyrdom of King Charles I., anything in the whole Book of God to warrant the rebellion? 'Why, yes: Daniel dreamed a dream, and there is also something in the Revelations concerning a Beast, and a little Horn, and a fifth Vial, and therefore the King ought undoubtedly to die; but if neither you nor I can gather so much from these places, they will tell us it is because we are not inwardly enlightened. But others more knowing, but not less wicked, insist not so much on the warrant of it from Scripture, but plead providential dispensations;'† the latter, be it observed, a favourite plea with some divines who had sworn allegiance to William and Mary.‡ If the apocalyptic divines of those days were more absurd than Dr. Cumming, South was a keener censor than any modern critic.

In his earlier days, casuistic questions were discussed with an eagerness and a subtlety never known in England since; Jeremy Taylor's 'Ductor Dubitantium,' and Baxter's 'Christian Direc-

---

* 'Sermons,' iv. 491. † Ibid., 502.

‡ Dryden alludes to it in the 'Character of a Good Parson,' who is clearly a non-juror:—

> 'Conquest, an odious name, was laid aside,
> Where all submitted, none the battle tried.
> The senseless plea of *right by Providence*
> Was by a flattering priest invented since.

tory'

tory' are well-known instances of a class of works numerous in the seventeenth century. It is evident that moral problems had a great charm for South. He preached frequently on the subject of conscience, and questions of morality are often discussed in sermons of which conscience is not the leading subject. But his plain directness of intellect, and sound moral sense, saved him from the hair-splitting distinctions and quibbling evasions which were too common in his time. Pascal himself had not a more decided abhorrence for the ingenious immoralities of the Jesuit moralists.* Like Chaucer's 'Poore Persone' he 'maked him no spiced conscience,' but hated all attempts to make 'black not so black, nor white so very white.' Nor did he less abhor the ungodly theology of the fanatics, which removed acts from the region of morality altogether. To 'persuade a man that a regenerate person may cheat, and lie, steal, murder and rebel, by way of infirmity, ... without any danger of damnation,' is indeed (as he says) 'a direct manuduction to all kinds of sin,'† and probably South had seen glaring instances of Antinomian licentiousness.

As to South's political opinions, it is hardly necessary to say that he was a firm and consistent advocate of 'passive obedience,' and a vehement hater of all republicans and their opinions. He preached repeatedly on the anniversary of King Charles I.'s death, and always bestows on the Royal Martyr praise as high as could be given to the greatest of the saints. And, with him, the obedience which subjects owed their sovereign was without condition or limit. Nothing can exceed his indignation against men like Knox and Buchanan, Pareus and Grotius, if they maintain that any violence on the part of the sovereign, any wrong even to religion, can justify resistance on the part of the subject.‡ His principal quarrel with the Westminster Confession is that it inculcates only a conditional obedience to the sovereign; Milton is never mentioned but as the 'blind adder who has spit so much poison on the King's person and cause,'§ and who 'was so bold as to absolve the subject from his allegiance.' ‖ And, so far as we know, he acted up to his principles. He never encouraged resistance to the actual sovereign; we do not read of his engaging in any of the Jacobite plots, in which so many clergymen were involved. Even to King William he appears to have been a faithful, if not a very loving subject. He was, in short, one of the most 'conservative' of the

* 'The Nature and Measures of Conscience.'—(*Sermons*, i. 367.)
† 'Of taking Pleasure in other Men's Sins.'—(*Sermons*, i. 292.)
‡ 'Sermons,' iv. 260 *ff.*; 367. § Ibid., iv. 502. ‖ Ibid., 262.

old

old cavaliers; new things pleased him not; he would none of the 'new philosophy,' whether of mind or matter; Descartes, the great master of thought in modern Europe, is (we think) only once mentioned by him, and then simply as an ethical philosopher; the Royal Society, which, while South was yet a young man, numbered Newton among its members, is never mentioned without a sneer; the Church, he says, 'is a Royal Society for settling old things, not for finding out new.'* We do not recollect any allusion to the subject, but it is extremely probable that he ignored Newton's great discovery, if not the Copernican system, to the day of his death.

But if he loved old principles and old thoughts, his style is redolent of the life of his own time. If he does indeed imitate any models, his models are found in the Roman classics, not in preceding writers of English. For in English he had no predecessor; his style is his own, made for his own purposes, and used with consummate art and vigour. He lived at an age when the stately periodic style, of which Hooker furnishes us with the noblest example, was passing away, and the lighter and easier manner of a more restless generation was coming in, while men yet retained a sense of the true value of words and their distinctions in meaning, which another generation somewhat wore away. South's was, in fact, perhaps the raciest period of English style; at least two of the greatest masters of English prose, Dryden and Locke, were his school-fellows, and many others whose names posterity will not willingly let die were his contemporaries. We have seen some specimens of his lighter style, his rapid turns, his pungent allusions, his flashing scorn. But these give an inadequate conception of his powers; he could treat nobler themes in a worthy manner. For instance, in the famous sermon on 'Man made in the Image of God' are passages not surpassed by the greatest masters of English eloquence. Take his description of the state of Adam in Paradise, which, though condemned by Coleridge as 'rabbinical dotage,'† is certainly a noble specimen of fine fancy and vigorous expression:—

'Adam . . . came into the world a philosopher, which sufficiently appeared by his writing the nature of things upon their names; he could view essences in themselves, and read forms without the comment of their respective properties; he could see consequents yet dormant in their principles, and effects yet unborn and in the womb

* 'Sermons,' i. 206.

† 'Aids to Reflection,' 'Spiritual Religion,' Aphorism X., p. 236 (ed. 1854). It is worth noticing, that South by no means countenances Coleridge's use of the words 'Reason' and 'Understanding.'

of their causes; his understanding could almost pierce into future contingents; his conjectures improving even to prophecy, or the certainties of prediction; till his fall it was ignorant of nothing but of sin, or at least it rested in the notion, without the smart of the experiment. Could any difficulty have been proposed the resolution would have been as early as the proposal; it could not have time to settle into doubt.

'Like a better Archimedes, the issue of all his inquiries was εὕρηκα, a εὕρηκα, the offspring of his brain without the sweat of his brow. Study was not then a duty, night-watchings were needless, the light of reason wanted not the assistance of a candle. This is the doom of fallen man, to labour in the fire, to seek truth *in profundo*, to exhaust his time and impair his health, and perhaps to spin out his days and himself into one pitiful, controverted conclusion. There was then no poring, no struggling with memory, no straining for invention; his faculties were quick and expedite; they answered without knocking, they were ready upon the first summons, there was freedom and firmness in all their operations. I confess it is difficult for us, who date our ignorance from our first being, and were still bred up with the same infirmities about us with which we were born, to raise our thoughts and imaginations to those intellectual perfections that attended our nature in the time of innocence, as it is for a peasant bred up in the obscurities of a cottage, to fancy in his mind the unseen splendours of a court. But by rating positives by their privatives, and other arts of reason by which discourse supplies the want of the reports of sense, we may collect the excellency of the understanding then, by the glorious remainders of it now, and guess at the stateliness of the building by the magnificence of its ruins. All those arts, rarities, and inventions which vulgar minds gaze at, the ingenious pursue, and all admire, are but the relics of an intellect defaced with sin and time. We admire it now only as antiquaries do a piece of old coin for the stamp it once bore, and not for those vanishing lineaments and disappearing draughts that remain upon it at present. And certainly that must needs have been very glorious, the decays of which are so admirable. He that is comely when old and decrepid, surely was very beautiful when he was young. An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise.'*

Many other passages show a mastery over the diction of more severe eloquence very remarkable in one who was hardly inferior to Swift himself in the use of homely words for the purpose of ridicule or invective. Sometimes, in his higher mood, South reminds us of Bossuet; there is the same positiveness of mind, the same powerful wielding of the language of indignation or scorn; the same skill in setting off his own case in attractive colours, while he weakens that of his adversary.

* 'Sermons,' i. 24, 25.

But

But he lacks Bossuet's persuasive art; he is very inferior to him in range of thought, and he is entirely destitute of the tender mysticism which we find in Bossuet, and which underlies, indeed, his most vigorous declamation. If Bossuet is not unfitly compared to an eagle, South must be content to be a falcon, though a falcon of keen eye and vigorous flight. There is something in his manly English temper and unhesitating decision which we cannot help liking, even while we disapprove his hardness; we can well believe that he was a genial and kindly companion, though he could not resist the temptation of saying sharp things; and we take leave of him with the impression that we have been in the company of a wit, a scholar, and a theologian whose abilities, in his own line, cannot easily be surpassed.

ART. IV.—1. *Special Report from the Select Committee on the Oxford and Cambridge Universities' Education Bill, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* 1867.

2. *Suggestions on Academical Organisation, with especial reference to Oxford.* By Mark Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. 1868.

3. *Universities Past and Present. A Lecture delivered December* 22, 1866, *in the University Hall at Munich.* By J. J. Ignatius Döllinger, D.D., &c. Translated by C. E. C. B. Appleton, B.C.L., &c.

4. *Pass and Class. An Oxford Guidebook through the Courses of Literæ Humaniores, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Law and Modern History.* By Montagu Burrows, Chichele Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. 3rd Edition. 1866.

5. *The Student's Guide to the University of Cambridge.* 2nd Edition, 1866.

6. *An Address delivered by way of Inaugural Lecture, February* 7, 1867. By the Rev. W. Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.

7. *Plea for a Fifth Final School. A Letter, &c.* By the Rev. J. W. Burgon, Fellow of Oriel, Vicar of St. Mary's, and Gresham Lecturer in Divinity. 1868.

8. *Notes on the Academical Study of Law.* By Mountague Bernard, M.A., Chichele Professor of International Law and Diplomacy in the University of Oxford. 1868.

9. *Report of the Royal (Oxford) University Commission.* 1852.

10. *Report and Evidence upon the Recommendations of Her*

Majesty's Commissioners, &c. Presented to the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors. 1853.

11. *Sir William Hamilton's Discussions on Philosophy, Literature, Education, and University Reform.* 2nd Edition. 1853.
12. *The English Universities.* By Professor Huber. Translated by F. W. Newman.
13. *Kahnis' Internal History of German Protestantism.* 1856.
14. *The Re-organisation of the University of Oxford.* By Goldwin Smith. 1868.
15. *Schools and Universities on the Continent.* By Matthew Arnold, M.A., &c. London, 1868.

WE shall not be accused of disrespect to any other Universities if we announce that our title refers to Oxford and Cambridge. These are the two 'eyes of England,' for which so many doctors are prescribing. Which are the faculty? Which are the quacks? Are their prescriptions likely to give a clearer vision to these organs? Or will they produce an absolute blindness? Further questions arise; are these institutions 'eyes' at all? And if so, are they suiting themselves by the healthy process of a natural expansion of the pupil (our readers will not suspect us of a pun) to the light of the world in which they find themselves?

By way of getting at once into the middle of the subject, let us observe that amidst the multitude of cries raised by the reformers for several years past may be detected more or less plainly a key-note. At the root of their most vigorous and persistent efforts will be found a fixed idea as to what a University ought to be, almost wholly different from that which governs the facts as we find them in England. In other words, men appear to be arguing on a common basis, when they are really proceeding from a totally different one. The realisation of that idea is to be found in Germany. Some time ago this was not the case. The reformers were satisfied with a constant recurrence to the earliest English medieval, non-Collegiate pattern, forgetting the safeguards under which it existed, the history of its disorders and reforms, and the subsequent changes in the constitution of English society, politics, and religion. The existing German model has now taken the place of this shadowy form. If we state concisely what that model is, and place side by side with it the facts about Oxford and Cambridge, and if we then give a specimen of the latest prescriptions, we shall explain our meaning.

In Germany the Universities, very numerous, and all wonderfully similar in their broad outlines, are supported, with very few

few exceptions, by grants from their respective Governments. Very few of them have any endowments at all. They are under the direct control of the State. A special Cabinet Minister manages their affairs. They are free from any taint of particular religious government, the most perfect freedom and equality between different religions being of their very essence. They set before themselves a two-fold object—the promotion of learning and science on the one hand, direct education for certain professions, those for which Government makes a University degree necessary, on the other. They leave the student entirely free, attempting to exercise no moral or religious control of any kind over him,* but simply providing a police for general supervision, a magistrate for law, and a prison for flagrant delinquents. The students have 'the right (within very wide limits) of choosing the subject of their lectures, of hearing what lectures they please, as many or as few as they please, and when and how they please.' They have no general system of examinations like the English Universities, the students of the 'bread-studies,' as they are called, Divinity, Law, and Medicine, being alone required to pass any examination at all, and that not involving anything but a very faint approach to the Honour List of Oxford and Cambridge. The Governments, indeed, by insisting on the 'bread-students' hearing certain lectures, exercise a practical control over the education of that portion of the University youth; but the students of 'Philosophy' (which includes everything but the bread-studies), are under no limitation whatever. The bread-students thus commence at the Universities (and have indeed commenced at the public schools, which are equally under the control of the Governments) a system in which they find themselves involved throughout their career. 'Every profession is really a State office; they are all offices under Government; every clergyman, every lawyer, and every medical man is an officer under Government more or less.' †

With scarcely an exception these Universities possess no Collegiate system, no visible University, the students living independently in lodgings, and largely frequenting public-houses, where they generally have hired rooms.‡ These institutions

* Dr. Perry's Evidence in the Blue Book at the head of our list. This very competent witness, who says that he has lived for twenty years at German Universities, passed through them himself, and been intimate with their great men, and who enthusiastically admires their system, admits that he sees 'very great evils arising from the entire emancipation of German students from religious control.'

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. 'The University police generally go the rounds of the beer-houses and wine-houses, and turn the students out at a certain time of night.' Duelling is part of their system.

are

are filled with a very much larger proportion of students from the lower classes than Oxford and Cambridge, 'five-sixths of them being,' it is said, 'poor men according to our ideas.'*

Their leading feature is the Professoriate. Everything hangs upon that body. The Professors are the governors of the Universities under the Cabinet Minister. They are paid partly by the Government and partly by fees. Through the efforts of the State to secure the best men; through the rivalry between States and Universities, as well as between the Professors themselves; through the Professoriate being a regular profession, to which men devote themselves from an early age; and finally in consequence of the few openings for an independent career in Germany—almost all the intellectual eminence of the country is concentrated in the Universities.† Books are chiefly written there; the press of the country is controlled and influenced directly from those centres; the policy of Germany is powerfully affected by these Professors, and they not unfrequently make their way straight from the professorial to the senatorial seat.

As the Universities undertake to turn out men completely fitted for the liberal professions, much of the work done at them is of course nothing more than that drilling in multiform detail which in England goes on during apprenticeship, so to speak, in the professions themselves. On all other subjects besides these the rivalry amongst the Professors has the good effect of stimulating and advancing the higher class of studies, but, it must also be said at the expense of anything like a fixing or steadying of the youthful mind. The whole system being that of teaching by Professors' lectures, and not by books or examinations, school follows school, theory theory, till there is nothing received, nothing old, no foundation laid. In the professed home of free thought there is for the mass no freedom of thought. After a school has had its day some abler man than his fellows strikes out a new line, and anon the whole body of students, who have servilely followed the fashionable teacher, go over to the new man, who demolishes the system of his predecessor. He is always a man of mark. Crowds dwell on his lips, write down every word he says, copy even his physical peculiarities. Unprepared by any previous study, they are at his mercy. There is no time for thought. Brilliant speculation, daring theory, dazzling rhetoric, rule the hour. What is carried away from the Professor is wholly untested; there is

* Dr. Perry's Evidence, &c.

† The effect of this concentration of intellect at the Universities is, of course, to impoverish the rest of the country. Dr. Perry says that 'there is a far greater number of well-educated men in English than in German society.'

no

no attempt to remove erroneous impressions. Thus fashion, accident, individual genius, govern the mental condition of University life.* The effect of this 'freedom' on the character and creed of Germany is too well known to need remark. Zealous lecturing, great scholarship, industrious research, profound thought, are no doubt obtained amongst a certain limited class, but at an expense which may well make Englishmen question whether it may not possibly be better to exist without them.

Let us now proceed to describe, side by side with the above outline, what are the fundamental ideas of Oxford and Cambridge.

They differ, in the first place, from the German Universities, in being very ancient, independent corporations with independent Courts of law, and privileges of various kinds. The State interferes with them no more than it does with any other corporation in the realm. It has on the whole left them to manage their own affairs, with only such occasional interference as any great changes in the nation, or the proof of any particular abuses may demand. There is no such thing as a supervision by any State officer, no action of the State further than the appointment of a very few Professors, whose chairs have been founded by past Governments. In a word, a leading idea is independence and self-government.

Next, they are in the closest connexion with a particular religious system. At Oxford every Doctor and Master of Arts, at Cambridge every Member of the Senate, must be a member of the Church of England, and sign a test to that effect. This provision, and the Act of Uniformity, also protect, though not absolutely, the Colleges. Those who are not members of the Church of England may receive their education at the Universities freely and without molestation, but may not meddle with the revenues or government of bodies which were founded by and for Churchmen, and constantly confirmed to Churchmen by the nation. This connexion discovers itself in University Church Services and sermons, regular attendance of Graduates and Undergraduates at College Chapels, examinations in elementary Divinity, education to a large extent by clergymen, the constant interchange of clergymen between the Universities and the parish churches of the realm, the presence of a certain number of

* Dr. Pusey's Evidence in the Blue Book mentioned above, and also in the Report, &c. presented to the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, 1853. The only antidote to this glaring vice of the system seems to lie in the number of Universities, and the practice of men attending more than one. For the rapid succession of schools during the last century *see* Kahnis' 'Internal History of German Protestantism.'

University

University men as Bishops in the House of Lords, the preparation at the Universities of a large proportion of their students for Holy Orders. This definite Church connexion, colouring the relations of the Universities with the whole nation, is then another fundamental idea.*

Next, these two institutions prescribe to themselves as their main object and duty the education of young men after they leave school. The promotion of learning and science is regarded as of secondary importance. Teaching is the special function of Professors and Tutors. Certain standard books are used as text-books, a system more developed at Oxford than at Cambridge, but characteristic of both places. Examinations are, with some exceptions, the constant accompaniment of all teaching in all stages; examinations of an extremely severe kind, and attracting the eager competition of the ablest youth of the country, for those abler men; of a somewhat lax nature, too lax, for the rest. To some extent, no doubt, learning and science are promoted; but to a far less degree than in Germany. Thus, naturally, the Tutorial element is far more developed than the Professorial. There is little or none of that rivalry of Professors, that fame of particular men, that tossing and shifting of opinion, which is characteristic of Germany. Thus, naturally, the supervision of the students' course of study is of a different kind. They are free, and yet not free; free within well ascertained limits. They have large areas of choice within those limits, but the border-lines are rigorously defined. Another fundamental idea then, is that of mental and moral training under a fixed but elastic system.

Next, the Collegiate system takes the place at Oxford and Cambridge of the perfectly free and independent individualism which almost universally prevails in the German institutions. Every student must belong to some College or Hall. Every man's habits of life are known and controlled by University and College officers. He is responsible to a particular College Tutor as well as to the Head of his House, the Proctors and the Vice-

* The effects of the existing system are more conspicuous than is sometimes supposed, not only in the manners and style of Oxford and Cambridge men, but in their life and character. It may certainly be asserted that their morality is higher, though there are of course black sheep, than that of any similar body of young men in the world, and there is a wide and deep vein of earnest religion amongst them. Dr. Pusey speaks in his Evidence (before Mr. Ewart's committee) of a college where 'one-third are weekly communicants, many more are more than monthly communicants, and not a bad word is spoken in the college.' This is no uncommon case. The sums raised among them for charitable purposes are astonishing. College chapels are no longer (to the vast majority) the penance they once were. No one accuses them of want of spirit, yet fighting and duelling are simply unheard of amongst them.

Chancellor.

Chancellor. Some modification of this law is found at Cambridge, where a man may live in lodgings from the first, but only in lodgings under the systematic supervision of his College, being as much bound to College chapel, lectures, and meals, as if he had rooms within the walls; and at Oxford after three years' residence, when he migrates to lodgings, under less restraint than at Cambridge. This College life means the constant living, more or less, in the midst of a particular set of men of the same age, mixing with them at meals, lectures, Chapel, amusements, the connexion with a particular set of senior men as Tutors, the obedience to certain not very stringent rules, the *esprit de corps* of an old-established body with which an intimate connexion is formed for life by the youth who enters it, and who becomes a sharer in its glories, its difficulties, its character, and its influence. These bodies are endowed, some very richly, not by the nation, but by particular benefactors. The officers being paid chiefly out of these endowments, the security for efficiency lies in the test of examination for Fellowships, the action of public opinion, the rivalry of Colleges. A common, quasi-family life, is then another fundamental idea. The Universities are composed of a number of families bound together by very numerous ties, interlacing one another in every possible manner. A visible University, or rather a set of buildings, mostly Collegiate, but a few common to all, with their adjuncts of groves and gardens, characterises Oxford and Cambridge. We can hardly conceive of them except under that aspect.

Finally, the system deliberately adopted is one which contemplates formation of the mind rather than information—general, rather than special preparation for after life. All students alike are obliged to show that they have attained to a certain proficiency in the liberal studies before pursuing even those elements of particular studies which are connected with professions. No State requirements force an examination on the Universities for particular professions, all such matters being left in this country to settle themselves by the action of public opinion and the law of supply and demand.

Here, then, there is evidently no slight and trivial difference of detail, but an antagonism of fundamental ideas. The English and the German Universities are two distinct species. Nor by any Darwinian theory can we trace the difference to a process of 'natural selection.' They are each of them the result of national circumstances and historical facts. They are not the product of deliberate and philosophical forethought. The national formation of Germany—its division, in consequence of the peculiar and unique growth of its feudal and imperial system, into for the

the most part small, semi-independent, rival territories—the despotic government of those territories—the hold of the Reformation over the most active and vigorous portions of the nation—the peculiar character of that Reformation—the religious wars which intensified territorial differences—the comparatively late period at which the civilisation of the people as a whole took place—these circumstances, taken along with the peculiar nature of the German mind, speculative, industrious, independent, will largely account for the character of their Universities. The most distinguished are also the latest creations. Berlin, Bonn, and Munich, have been founded in the present century. They, no doubt—and all the rest, far more than Oxford and Cambridge—have partaken of the more systematic character of modern ideas, and are far less than our own the result of circumstances.

Oxford and Cambridge are the children of the past. They are themselves a 'history of England.' Their unbroken continuity from the remotest periods of that history, and their share in all the political and religious changes of the country, have made them what they are. They bear a distinctly medieval impress, modified and indented by the changes of every age, so that in each age they have met what was required of them. It is certainly not the impress they would have borne had they started full-grown, full-armed, from the brain of some modern Jove. Their Collegiate character, for example, has mainly grown out of the efforts of good men, at different periods, to mitigate the abuses of the older license, and to promote the National as distinguished from the Roman character of our clergy. The endowments with which they so liberally and nobly supplied their institutions have formed a Tutorial system, to which the Professoriate has been an addition—a superstructure slowly and laboriously erected. That Collegiate and Tutorial system has carried with it the adoption of the principle of mental and moral training; for the inmates of a family must conform to the rules of the family, and their work as well as everything else must partake of the 'common life.' The Church character of these institutions is the result of the ecclesiastical nature of their medieval foundation, exceptionally saved in England by the peculiar conditions of the English Reformation. Bodies which had been the centres of reforming movements during the time of the Roman obedience became naturally the centres of the Reformation when Church and State reformed themselves. The insularity of our people—the union of the different races of which they are composed—the compactness of the island, with its facilities of communication between all parts—the wealth of its population, affording a very large class of men of leisure—the freedom on the whole from great convulsions—

convulsions—the conservative character of English law—are all ingredients in the formation and perpetuation of our Universities. They are, in fact, the only things in England which can stand comparison in every respect with the Constitution of the Church and State themselves. They have run parallel with both, and will no doubt share their fate, whatever it may be.

We say, then, that in considering the proposals for reform or 'organisation' of Oxford and Cambridge, it is not only right but necessary to enquire what people mean. Have they taken the German Universities for their model, and set themselves to destroy the English character of our institutions in order to reconstruct them after that model? Or are they content to retain all that is old and valuable in them, merely desiring to expose abuses and set them free to work up to their capacity? Do they wish to deal with the matter as if it were a *tabula rasa*, to take what they think is abstractedly the best course, ignoring the past, or to take facts as they find them, treating them like practical men? Do they prefer the intellectual model, such as we know it in ancient Athens, such as we find it in the mind of Plato—the Greek type of which the modern German is in many respects the copy, or the Christian system as it exists amongst ourselves, the growth and outcome of Christian life, the product and child of Christianity amidst a highly religious and settled community?

To distinguish between these two types and to expose the mischief of confusing them, is not to deny that there are merits peculiar to each. Some lessons may be learnt, as we hope to show, from the system of our neighbours. We may have a genuine English reform without a revolution—a real progress on the old lines as distinguished from a mock illusory progress carrying us in another direction—a real regress. On the Continent it is satisfactory to observe, in the same way, that there is a growing perception of English merits. Men are beginning to admit that they admire the very things which our home detractors declare to be so deplorable. Our much-abused Collegiate system and moral training of youth is the envy of those who do not possess them.* It is not long since the French Emperor sent over a Commission of Inquiry into this system with a view to the reproduction of what France has never yet been able to recover since the Revolution swept it away. It would be doing an injustice to both the Scotch and German Universities to place them in the same category; but in the want of most of the features which distinguish Oxford and Cambridge they may be classed together,

* Dr. Döllinger in his 'Universities Past and Present.'

and

and it is observable that a very promising re-introduction of the Collegiate system has been lately commenced at St. Andrew's. The growing cosmopolitanism of the age is making itself felt. We are all inquiring and learning about each other. The danger is lest, in the ardour of what is to many a new discovery, a fatal eagerness to disparage ourselves should destroy that modest appreciation of our own advantages which it is our plainest duty to cultivate, lest, in short, one side of the question should be regarded to the exclusion of the other.

For a fair sample of the demands of a large class of University Reformers, Mr. Pattison's very able book may be now examined. Let us place his demands by the side of the facts as we have given them. He speaks the sense of many leading reformers in the House of Commons, of Mr. Grant Duff, for example, whose speeches in and out of the House leave us in no doubt of his sentiments. In the evidence before the Committee of the House on Mr. Ewart's Bill will be found the same ideas put forth by Honourable Members in their questions, and by several Oxford and Cambridge witnesses in their answers. Less fully developed some years ago, they yet find a congenial home in the Bluebook containing the Report of the University Commission.

It does not cost much trouble to get at the fundamental idea of Mr. Pattison's reforms. The English notion of a University education he at once boldly pronounces to be a mistake. He proposes 'nothing less than a change in the aims and objects of Oxford' (p. 324). Universities are not meant to educate youth. They may do it by the way; young men may come and listen to Professors; but the true, normal function of these personages is the pursuit of learning and science, and for them Universities exist. As the high priests of science it is their calling to interpret it and hand it down to their successors. Everything is therefore to be sacrificed to their exaltation and encouragement. The Professoriate should be a regular profession, largely endowed, very numerous, the object of ambition to all literary men, open to all alike. In order to apply this doctrine to the existing English system, the Colleges, which now swarm with young, active life, are to be emptied of the real intruders and set aside for the true men, the Professors, along with their wives and families. The College endowments are to be 'remodelled, and the College buildings gradually appropriated to the use of the professor-fellows of the several faculties' (p. 239). He sketches some elementary details of his plan, taking a fact where he can as suggestive of a method of proceeding. Some of these facts indeed afford but a slender basis. Oriel is the College of Bishop Butler; therefore it may be

be set aside for Moral and Mental Science, 'merging in its foundation the present Logic, White's, and the Waynflete Chairs.' On the other hand, it is to strip itself of the only existing fact which does bear on the subject, viz., that it at present provides the salary of the Regius Professor of Modern History; this gentleman's home, along with his colleague's at All Souls, being transferred bodily to Queen's; which College, after the expulsion of its present inhabitants, is to absorb all present and future Historical and cognate Professorships. All Souls, having already a tendency to constitute itself in a legal direction, is to be helped to eject every non-legal element, and to become the exclusive home of Law. Physical Science is to build itself a permanent nest at Corpus and Merton, and 'if to Corpus and Merton were added the splendid endowments of Magdalen, the Mathematical and Experimental sciences would not be occupying a larger space in our establishment than their importance entitled them to' (p. 191). The Colleges which are to be made homes for the families of Professors of Philology, Medicine, Art, Architecture, Civil Engineering, and so forth, are not named, the above being a concession to the weakness of the English imagination in supplying an example or two of the author's meaning. Not that he proposes a violent invasion of existing interests. These are to be secured. The succession to livings will remove many of the incumbrances.

But how to provide for the Undergraduates, for whom these Colleges have been either built or enlarged during the course of the last six centuries? We say built or enlarged, because, whatever the ideas of the earliest founders may have been, the circumstances of the nation from age to age, the public opinion and the legislation of the country, have turned them into homes for the temporary reception and education of young men. Not a single College of the older foundations * remains now on its original contracted scale, and the more modern ones have provided from the first what was required. Even that original contracted scale implied much more of the modern idea than some rather one-sided explorers of the medieval statutes have confessed. No doubt the idea of the pursuit of learning was present to the minds of the early founders in a more decided form than modern University education expresses, but it was connected with the education of persons, who, if they remained longer under the College roof, began their career much earlier than the present Undergraduates, the school-system of modern times not being then in existence, persons also who were expected to go forth into

* All Souls must be excepted at Oxford.

the

the world for posts of usefulness in Church and State, and who did so go forth.

These youths then, for whose training the wisdom of our ancestors has so carefully provided, are to be summarily and literally turned out into the streets. They have no vested interests. They are to go into private lodging-houses: or if any College, not yet absorbed by Professors and their families, chooses to admit them, they may be admitted there, but on a wholly different footing from the present, conforming indeed to the general rules of the House, but responsible alone to their Tutor, who may be selected out of the whole University. In short the present system of 'training,' which the author admits is 'the best to be had at this time in Europe' (p. 97), and under which 'we have greatly improved the character of the work done here in the last thirty years' (p. 273), is to be sacrificed to the interests of the Professoriate and the iron claims of a perfect Undergraduate freedom.*

Not even is the separate and independent position of these Professor-nurseries to be retained; for their funds are to be placed in the hands of a functionary who will manage the whole in common. The characteristic examinations will next be swept away. Only those who enter for an Honour Course will attract the attention of the purified Laputa. Its dignity will not be sullied by contact in any shape with Passmen. There will still no doubt be 'students not candidates for a degree residing irregularly'—very irregularly, we suspect—for the benefit of the Lectures (p. 321), but they may do what they please. Neither College Heads nor College Tutors, nor stated Examinations, will any longer bring them to book. A happy life is in store for them. The Honour Course will not be swept away like the other, but will be altered in almost every respect. Examinations will no longer be the guiding element in the system; that position being taken by the Professors' Lectures, and the Examinations having reference rather to what has been learnt from them. The Oxford system of examining in certain books, which Cambridge is now to some extent following, is, of course, 'Nehushtan.' It is the stronghold of that narrow, antiquated spirit which has been at the bottom of all the mischief. A system of compulsory attendance on Professors will then be possible.

Finally, to make the likeness to the author's model complete, the Theological department must be gradually placed on a

* Mr. Mill, in his Inaugural Address at St. Andrew's, said that 'the old English Universities, in the present generation, are doing better work than they have done within human memory in teaching the ordinary studies of their curriculum.'

totally

totally different footing. 'Theology has not begun to exist as a science among us'—not only in the sense that it is little studied, which is true enough, but in the sense of never yet having been allowed to show its face except 'in concert with the Heads of the Church' (p. 177). The Divinity Examinations which now form part of the course are an empty 'academic tradition continued from mere habit.' It is only in a somewhat distant future that the author can contemplate the possibility of a free course for Theology. 'In the present state of the public mind in this country, it is hopeless to propose to assign to it the place and rank which is its due' (p. 300). It throws some light upon his meaning to observe that he is possessed with the terrible nightmare of a 'Catholic' or 'Anglican' party, a party of 'growing strength' (p. 298), bearing down upon his University and laying its heavy hand upon the Philosophical School, a school by-the-by which he mercilessly attacks himself.

On one point Mr. Pattison apparently deserts his German model; but we are not sure if it is more than an apparent desertion. He seems to have persuaded himself that there will be vitality enough in the new University, when once set going on its new course, to govern itself. The authoritative and absolute interference of the nation in order to set it going he not only desires, but vehemently claims as a national duty. This, however, he supposes to be no more out of order than the interferences of Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and Laud. But it must be observed that the proposed changes are wholly different in kind and degree from those effected in former times; and it requires a robust faith to believe that, when all the ancient landmarks are removed, the ship can be navigated without the incessant supervision of a superior power in the shape of a State officer of some sort or other. The independent, self-governing position of these venerable bodies would beyond doubt pass away with all the rest, and the State-governed, departmental German University take its place.

The issue then is broad and palpable. Mr. Pattison has spoken out more plainly than others, and perhaps will receive small thanks for his pains; but the voices raised of late amongst us are in reality pitched in the same key. The German type is the new model. Are we prepared to accept it, or are we resolved to keep this unique possession, this priceless national inheritance, 'which has come down to us through so many centuries, and which, if once destroyed, it will be impossible to restore?'* This is one of the most interesting of the many

* Oxford Appeal to the Archbishop of Canterbury against the Abolition of University Tests.—*Vide* 'Times,' March 2.

questions

questions now before the nation. We are much mistaken if, when the issue is fairly joined, there will not be such a response, such a rally from all quarters of the land as will cause the revolutionary party to put by its schemes for a more favourable opportunity.

It would be interesting, and, if space allowed, this would be the proper place for it, to trace the difference between the results of the systems of the two countries; to show how far short the German Universities fall of providing an education for the upper and upper-middle classes, while the shop-keeping class receives more than its due share; to trace exactly the opposite class of facts in the English system. It will be enough to say here of those who leave our own Universities that the nation appears to be very well satisfied with them. No clergy are, on the whole, such favourites as ours. Not long ago the Universities supplied five-sixths of them, and even now they supply two-thirds. No upper-school masters are so completely trained for their work; no statesmen or country gentlemen of a higher type than our own exist. The only complaint as to the bar and other professions is that University men are drained off into so many new openings that they do not supply as many recruits for the old professions as might be wished. The ranks of literature swarm with these men, and it is they who hold the press at its present high level. If they write comparatively few books while *at* the Universities, they write under the influence of the training received there. Certainly England has done as much for science as any other nation.

So far from the nation being ready to exchange its own English type for the German, we assert that it is well aware that it possesses an excellent thing, a thing of which it only desires to have a little more; and we are sure that no sensible man, who can look at all sides of the question, could recommend it to make the exchange. The gain would be more than doubtful, the loss certain, enormous, irremediable. But it does not follow that these institutions are beyond improvement; it does not follow that there may not be some points in the German system which might be incorporated, without injuring our own; it does not even follow that we may not take a leaf or two out of Mr. Pattison's clever, but revolutionary book. No doubt the roots of our University life are intimately intertwined with one another. We hold it to be a principle that they should not be disturbed; but the earth may be dug up a little round about them. If we see a branch bearing less fruit than it ought, it may be from want of such tending and pruning. It may, indeed, be a sign of decay, decay produced

produced by some past, unskilful tampering with the roots, or the removal of some shelter and protection. Possibly even this may be remedied; it may not be too late.

Some of the defective points in the University system are generally admitted, and shall now be taken in order.

The intellectual training of that large portion of men who only aspire to the Ordinary, or Poll, or Pass Degree, is decidedly below the proper level of a University. Mr. Pattison, we have seen, would impatiently sweep away the whole system of Pass examinations. This would be suicidal. It would at once dissever from our Universities most of our nobility and gentry, a very large proportion of our clergy, lawyers, and professional men. Whatever may be done in Germany, we can hardly conceive that any large portion of this exceedingly practical English people would now-a-days care to send their sons where they were suffered to do precisely what they pleased. This was, indeed, the state of things in the last century. The old system of Exercises and Disputations had died out; the new one of General Public Examinations had not come in. What that state of things was is only too well known. While some great men at either University kept alive the old traditions, and showed by their splendour what the darkness was out of which the light came, the conditions both of Tutorial and Undergraduate life were below contempt. The low condition of the clergy only too faithfully showed what the Universities had become, and itself reacted only too efficiently on the places of their training. The very thought of a recurrence to a system of unexamined youth at Oxford and Cambridge is enough to make any reflecting person shudder. Very little more to be desired is the other alternative, a much diminished University of Honour men alone.

The present system of General Public Examinations for all Undergraduates commenced with the present century. Under this system the Universities have advanced to their present high position as educating bodies. Among its first fruits must be prominently placed that enormous improvement of our clergy, which the veteran statesman, Mr. Grenville, remarked some few years ago, at the close of his long life, was by far the most remarkable change he had witnessed since the days of his youth. We shall point out presently that the competitive portion of this system, the Honour Course, has been over stimulated. A different fate has overtaken the Pass Course. In spite of various attempts to make it more worthy of the Universities, it remains in a very unsatisfactory state.

The Pass Course—we use the Oxford term, but neither University

versity can look down on the other—is the product of two things, (1) the experienced necessity for publicly and therefore similarly examining every student before he takes his degree, which of itself enforces a low standard on the part of the University; and (2) the Collegiate system, which has hitherto kept up the tradition of College independence as to the right of judging and fixing the intellectual condition of young men at entrance; this keeps the standard lower still. Obviously if no College could enter students unless they had attained to a definite stage of proficiency in given subjects, the whole mass at the end of two or three years might be examined on the footing of the proficiency which experience showed ought to be attained by men of average abilities and industry. But so far from this, every possible variety exists at different Colleges and Halls, from a high, competitive, excluding standard, to keep out any but the most promising men, down to no examination of any sort whatever. Thus men at these inferior Colleges and Halls, absolutely ignorant of the rudiments of a liberal education, are thrown into the scale. The standard must necessarily be fixed at the lowest possible point. No examiners can go beyond a certain number of 'plucks.' Papers of any sort may be set, but the real question is, of course, as to the sort of answers which the majority will give. Examiners change every two years; the material remains the same.

The obvious remedy is to take the question of previous training out of the hands of small and interested bodies, and to establish a University Matriculation or Entrance Examination. This has been proposed over and over again, but has hitherto failed. The Colleges have always put forth the specious argument that such a Procrustean rule would prevent many men from coming up to reside who would otherwise have become ornaments to the University; an argument true in itself, but worthless by the side of the discredit brought upon the University by the low standard of the unprepared men; still more when the certain effect (after a short time) of this general entrance examination upon the whole education of the country is taken into account. Who can doubt that the schools which send boys to the Universities would in absolute self-defence find methods of bringing them up to the required point? At present their most idle and ignorant boys make their way within the sacred precincts, and, once there, are safe. No vengeance can be visited on the schools from whence they come. Their old masters have washed their hands of them, and their subsequent frequent 'plucks' and lengthened residence are placed to the account of the too facile Alma Mater, which should never have received

received them. As to isolated cases of blameless ignorance, what can be plainer than that the industrious men who, after they come into residence, are able to master the difficulties arising from deficient training, could, if they were obliged, bring themselves up to the required point before they came? This feeble, nay, ridiculous argument finds a certain support from the men of the extreme left, who, like Mr. Pattison, profess to disapprove any limitation whatever of perfect freedom, and who, to be consistent, are obliged to give up all idea of Pass examinations in any form. Public opinion is, however, forming itself within the Universities on this point. If it is not speedily effective, the next University Commission (*quod absit*) will certainly enforce the measure.

Meanwhile, despairing of an equalisation of the men at starting, reformers at both Universities are studying to make the Pass Course more worthy of its aim and object. At Oxford, which has for the last sixteen years had a midway examination called Moderations, and which thus stops the Passman, and makes him give an account of himself in each year of his course, the clumsy system of examining these men finally in two Schools is likely to be very soon abolished. A single School, embracing a wider range of subjects, including Physical Science, Mathematics, and History, without giving up Classics, will probably be substituted in its place. With some proposed improvement in the Pass work at Moderations, especially the inclusion of a knowledge of the matter of the books as well as the text, this course will at last be respectable in theory, and if the Entrance Examination is carried, in practice also. The degree will also be taken in a shorter time. Cambridge has lately followed the example of Oxford in establishing a midway (or 'General') examination for the Ordinary (or Pass) degree, while the double examination in the Final Schools it has never possessed. It is remarkable in how many ways the two Universities have been gradually approximating.

A system of examinations has been hitherto taken for granted. The possibility of leaving alone that large class of men who can never rise above a Pass Course has not been admitted for a moment. But before we speak of the higher class of men who are able and willing to obtain from a University all it can impart, a word or two on competitive examinations is necessary.

Few more remarkable phenomena have characterised the present century than the gradually increasing rage for competitive examinations in England. Its origin must certainly be traced to the impulse given by these very bodies whose reform we

are now considering.* It is a most respectable origin, for it was a noble attempt to destroy a mass of ignorance and corruption, to clear out an Augæan stable. Or shall we have recourse to a more savoury metaphor? Was it not the Prince of fairy story come to disenchant the spell-bound land, the Prince of truth and earnestness come to awaken the 'sleeping beauty' of old University life? We may almost literally apply the words of the poet:—

'The charm was snapt.
There rose a noise of striking clocks,
And feet that ran and doors that clapt,
And barking dogs and crowing cocks;
A fuller light illumined all,
A breeze through all the garden swept,
A sudden hubbub shook the hall,
And sixty feet the fountain leapt.'

Everything began to fall into its place—the tutors to teach, the students to learn, the Professors to come forward out of the dark, the schools connected with the Universities to catch the enthusiasm. Soon one profession after another broke the spell. The army and navy were no longer to be the refuge for the 'fool of the family,' still less what people used then to call 'the Church.' The impulse is by no means spent; the impact of the first motion still communicates itself from body to body. 'Local examinations' are dealing with classes which the certificated schoolmaster of an earlier date left untouched. The system has now, indeed, reached such a point that the reaction has begun to set in. Men begin to complain very loudly of this eternal round of examinations. They call it Chinese: they expose its evils: they hark back to the old system of sleep and ignorance, nepotism, and jobbery. It is in truth not difficult to detect these evils. Examinations have surely become too much an end-in-themselves. Too many men spend the energies of a whole life in attaining a distinction which is to confer on them substantial rewards—fellowships, livings, Indian appointments, the Engineers. There is a vulgarity in this sort of thing, a sordid, mercenary spirit which smacks of the counter. Again, men learn with great rapidity, and then, having learnt for an object attained early in life, as quickly forget. The mind is ploughed up, and the intellectual seed sown, but it fails to

* Cambridge adopted competitive examinations in mathematics before the middle of last century, but they took no great development till after the wars of the French Revolution, when, with the influx of students and new ideas, both Universities started on a new course of energy and reform.

ripen.

ripen. Trained and furnished for practical life the subjects of the system may be, but the literary fruit is scant and juiceless. The old days of great scholars, living for learning's sake, content to be unobserved in life if they could only leave some mark behind, have almost passed away. Such men may not be so much required in the present day, but their gradual disappearance is a bad sign. The question now is—what place did a man take in the Oxford class-list or Cambridge tripos? not what proof has he given of being a man devoted to his subject, or skilled in teaching, or fitted to exercise great moral and religious influence?

The University Commission of 1850 and Act of Parliament of 1854 intensified the competitive system, by the throwing open of Scholarships and Fellowships. Abuses of many kinds were swept away and many good things with them, while some old evils which custom and public opinion mitigated, and to some extent neutralised, took a fresh lease of life under the sanction of express Parliamentary approval. The loss of provision for poor students, the discouragement of clerical education, and the promotion of the system of non-resident Fellows, are cases in point.

The true way of dealing with this question seems to be, not to pull down what has been built up with such great pains, not to recur to the German type of to-day, or the palæozoic formations of ancient England, but to ascertain, as in the Pass Course, what the mischief is, where the new growth has been too highly and exclusively developed. It is clear that we must legislate for men in general, not for the few nobler specimens which flourished during the old system, and which have been injured by the new. We may clear the way for them again, but to sacrifice the great mass of the superior youth and manhood of England to their advancement would be madness.

Cambridge, which began earliest, has hitherto exhibited the strongest instance of the worship of Examinations. The eminence of its Mathematical School is unique. Nothing approaches to the dignity of a Senior Wrangler. The competition of man against man (degenerating even into eager speculations as to the possible illness of this or that formidable competitor, and the study of the exact history, training, and previous successes of each man), the rivalry of private tutors, and the long traditions of this competition have produced, no doubt, great mathematical results. It seems a pity to disturb it. Yet, to the evils already mentioned are added the difficulty of making other subjects shoot up under the 'cold shade' of such an aristocracy; the poverty of the subject itself, as Sir William Hamilton well showed, taken as an education of the mind for

for future work; the failure, as he put it, which learning to swim in the heavy quicksilver of necessary matter produces upon the victim thrown afterwards into the less buoyant sea of a practical world governed by probable evidence. The too luxuriant growth of this mathematical competition has indeed been checked in some measure of late years by a series of successful efforts to give vigour and reputation to classical and other subjects. The Classical Tripos already contains nearly as many names as the Mathematical, and its value is rising every day. Changes of importance are about to be made in that Mathematical Tripos itself. Physical Science is to find a definite place in it. Mere rapidity of answering questions, gained, of course, at the expense of depth and learning, is to be neutralised by decreasing the number of questions; above all, the system of 'bracketing' is recommended to be 'freely used' by the Examiners; a form of expression for a partial imitation of the Oxford system which has never encouraged this excessive personal competition, but steadily stuck to the plan of leaving men undistinguished from one another in the various Class-lists. It would be perhaps as well if it were followed altogether.

The evil of the system of high-pressure examinations is not then quite so patent at Oxford; but it is considerable, and is besides developed in a special direction of its own. The Final School of Literæ Humaniores stands more by itself as a single attraction for the ablest men than any school at Cambridge now. The Law and History School has made a surprising growth for its age; but it cannot pretend in any way to compete with its rival and parent. Years and competition are necessary to make a 'School.'* The other two Oxford Schools hold no place at all. The Mathematical School has never flourished. That of Natural Science started with a little life, but has decayed already. It is undergoing a process of digging up and re-planting, the results of which we shall see by-and-by. This concentration of talent in one school has made it a most powerful engine for good or evil. Its strong philosophical element may be traced very largely to Sir William Hamilton. His powerful advocacy of that study as a means of mental training gradually produced a change in what had before been principally a school of linguistic study, a trial of Scholarship. On this foundation was now built a most

* 'I find the School of Law and Modern History occupying a well-defined and still improving position, and bestowing honours which the men most honoured in the other contests of the academic arena are glad not only to win but to work for.' Professor Stubbs' Inaugural Lecture, 1867. (p. 15.) 'The very advantageous position which, without nursing, I repeat, our study has attained here in men, books, and honours.' (p. 17.)

severe

severe examination into the matter of the books offered. No sooner was this knowledge of the logical and philosophical books reduced to a highly scientific form, than the need of a wider range of study was discovered. Unfortunately, here the system disclosed some unexpected results. If Philosophy had been the only subject of the school, it might have been studied in the complete manner which Sir William Hamilton wished; all sides of the subject would have found a place, and the supremacy of a particular set of writers might have been discouraged. But Ancient History and the prominence still given to Scholarship interfered with this position. It formed only one subject out of many in a curriculum of two years. Hence the need for easy, intelligible handbooks. One school of thought has produced such books, and one alone, that of Mr. Mill and Mr. Lewes. The views of Mr. Bain, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Buckle, and Auguste Comte, have set the tone for by far the largest number of men who have become distinguished in this School, and who were prepared for their teaching by the handbooks above named.* A hasty 'cram' of this sort of books, a rapid survey of the favoured ground over which successive examinations have run, the clever reproduction of notes from some sophistical lecturer or private tutor, have passed for 'Philosophy.' The sounder, but harder, and unfortunately more repulsive, books have been neglected and almost dropped out of the Schools. Mr. Pattison is perfectly justified in his depreciation of this one-sided, second-hand study. It is Protagoras over again, with his fifty-drachmæ argument, and the sordid Athenian youth buying the speech which is to gain his bread.

It must be admitted that a School which gathers in the ablest youths, and then exposes them, *through its shallowness and superficiality*, to a very probable overthrow of their faith and morals, is not a satisfactory thing. Common sense would point to a further division of the Oxford Final Schools. The faults of the over-developed Examination system, so intimately connected with the existence of a single great contest, would thus be mitigated; the better part of the German system which consists in specialising departments of knowledge would be introduced. As knowledge becomes the property of larger sections of men, this process must go on. To retain the deepening, enriching, and qualifying effects of Scholarship and Ancient History is a most desirable object; but it is only possible in the early stages of an

* It is not meant by this statement to imply that all properly speaking Metaphysical Philosophy is extinct at Oxford, but only that the metaphysicians find it very difficult to hold their own against the materialists.

academical

academical study of Philosophy. It is now a questionable advantage. 'Moderations' has also a tendency to come earlier in the course than it used, and thus to be less available for advanced philological competition. Comparative Philology is at the same time, in the hands of an able Professor and his pupils, advancing into a science. Ancient History is becoming a larger study; a second University teachership of the subject has just been established. There is, in short, plenty of scope for two distinct Schools, one of Literæ Humaniores or Classical Literature, and another of Philosophy. A higher standard, more worthy of a great University, would thus be reached in either subject. As for the difficulty of distinguishing one First-class man from another, the complaint is really part of the old mistaken notion of Examinations. Their true object is not to afford a means of 'ticketing' men, but to prove that a man has gone through a prescribed course with diligence and ability, and to encourage him to do so.

This process of division will sooner or later have to be carried further still. The two Schools above proposed are only divisions of the School of 'Arts.' But Divinity, Law, and Medicine were, as every one knows, the three Faculties in preparation for which the School of Arts originally existed. These Arts were the cuckoo's egg in the nest. The engrossing studies which clustered in the Middle Ages under the shelter of the Arts turned the old Trivium and Quadrivium into an arena for the Exercises of the Scholastic Philosophy, and, later on, into an exclusive School of Literæ Humaniores, something more human, more worthy of men, than what had in its turn become dry bones. This, together with the growing separation of ecclesiastical from secular employments, and the opportunities afforded by the metropolis for practical work, gradually ejected the studies of Law and Medicine. The study of Theology was also itself seriously affected by the prominence of the Arts, and at last all but dried up. There is now a strong feeling in favour of the restoration of these Faculties. To dream of bringing Law and Medicine back to the Universities in their old sense is of course Quixotic. Their home must still be the metropolis. Country towns cannot breed lawyers or medical men; but Universities may teach the rudiments of their respective studies in a philosophical manner. That is their function, a function quite distinct from the German method, while the German and old-English principle of using the University for the benefit of the professions may with safety and advantage be introduced or rather revived. Cambridge has pursued a different plan from Oxford in attempting this revival. A separate Law School

School has been for some time established, but has not taken much root; it has been abolished as a Pass Course since 1865. It has never been connected with the historical studies of the University, though a certain amount of Constitutional History is required. There was indeed no Historical School at Cambridge to force such a connexion; nor has there been much development of historical study there even of late years. The Ordinary or Pass degree alone deals with the subject.*

At Oxford the historical genius of the place was used as a nurse for the Law which even Blackstone had failed to plant securely. There has been a somewhat clumsy connexion of the two things in one School which has not worked ill on the whole. The interesting nature of the one subject has floated the dry details of the other. The Pass Course, though requiring elevation, has given that broad basis of general interest which is so necessary to push a School. It is a School full of life and improvement. The bearing of the two subjects on one another has been a decided element in its growth and vigour. But it is much questioned now whether there must not be a separation into two Schools. Professor Bernard's pamphlet, placed in our list at the head of this article, expresses the feeling of lawyers and many practical men. The question for them to consider is whether a School of Law will take root unassisted by that of History; whether on the other hand the study of Law in the present School of Law and History may not be so much improved under the two new Professors of the subject (the Corpus Professor of Law is about to be appointed) as to attain the required object without the risk of a collapse; whether compensation within the School might not be allowed, more Law and less History, and *vice versâ*. The Call to the Bar might be earned by the first alternative; the literary men would adopt the second. There is much interesting matter on this question of Law Studies in the evidence before the Inns of Court Commission. It is with the Inns of Court that the matter very much rests. By concert with the University authorities they may encourage efficient Law Schools, and it is high time some steps were taken in this direction.

In the same way it rests very much with the Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons to assist the revival of the preliminary studies of Medicine at both Universities. These studies find their home in the Natural Science School, and they are as properly part of the work of a University as the preliminary

* While these sheets are passing through the press, we observe that it is proposed to unite Law and History in one Honour School at Cambridge. The Classical Tripos seems also likely to receive some changes in the Oxford direction.

studies

studies for Divinity and Law. Their place has been accordingly granted of late years. But there has been great difficulty, in spite of assiduous 'nursing,' in fixing these studies in any satisfactory manner. The age at which the University Course is now taken—and it cannot be materially altered—has had much to do with this failure as regards the medical profession. Still there are prospects of improvement open in more than one direction in the Universities themselves. It must be the work of time, and there is no reason to despair. The connexion of the Mechanical portion of these studies with the ordinary work of a University degree will be a long step towards familiarising the University mind with the subject. It is also noticeable that at Oxford a large class has lately formed itself of young men who, without going into the 'Natural Science School,' attend lectures at the Museum in addition to their regular studies, for the purpose of obtaining a general acquaintance with scientific subjects. When a large body of men have mastered the rudiments an Honour School will gradually form. The Public Schools are also turning their attention to the matter: and so long as these studies are *sensibly* taught, are treated as auxiliaries, and are not suffered to usurp the place of the only two real formative subjects, Language and Mathematics,* nothing but good can come of this educational movement. Ignorance has been the fertile cause of the prevalence of many ridiculous theories of late years.

The difficulties attending the revival of the Theological Faculty are apparently less because its connexion with the Universities has never been so much lost to sight. A staff of Divinity Professors, attendance at their lectures, and a species of Divinity Examinations, have kept the connexion more before the public mind than in the other cases. At Cambridge indeed the 'Voluntary Theological Examination' as a sort of Pass Course, and the Theological Tripos for Honour men (who must, however, be already Graduates), have secured theoretically a fixed position for the study, but at neither University is there a living, working, improving School of Theology of the same sort as the other Schools, and the wisest men have hitherto decided against the establishment of such a School. At Oxford, however, a change has taken place. There seems now to be a

* The 'Essays on a Liberal Education' have not, we think, shaken, nor are they likely to shake, the opinion of intelligent men on this point. They will have, we hope, the effect of giving a more prominent place in schools to English literature. To those who care to see the picture of a thoroughly practical educator, demolishing these writers with the homely simplicity of a Socrates, we recommend a perusal of the Rev. Stephen Hawtrey's 'Narrative-Essay on a Liberal Education.' 1868.

feeling

feeling in its favour. A pamphlet just issued by Mr. Burgon enables us to state the case concisely. This writer vehemently advocates the revival of a study 'now lying prostrate.' He remarks on the increase of infidelity in his University, and on the shame of sending young men into Holy Orders with no better intellectual preparation in Theology than a dry and perfunctory attendance at the lectures of Divinity Professors, and the exceptional Theological College of a diocese. He maintains that a proper Theological School may well be instituted, with its apparatus of Pass and Class divisions, like the other Final Schools, and that there is no reason why proficiency in this subject should not be rewarded with Honours; he glances at the increased age at which men now come to the University, and the consequently smaller time left for studies not bearing on the final object, while in no profession is a man so suddenly thrown into a responsible position, or so unable to supply deficiencies. He meets the common objection to debasing Theological study, through bringing it into the hot struggle of the Class-list, by urging that the argument is already conceded in the examination for Theological prizes, and that the man's head, not his heart, is to be tested. A place in the Class-list would only testify attainments, not orthodoxy: Ordination is still a matter for the Bishops. The objection that the plan would open the way for the probable formation of an infidel School of Theology such as Germany has seen, for the creation of a Frankenstein that will devour him and his friends, he treats with the utmost indignation. If his *sine quâ non* is adopted—the appointment of Examiners by the Divinity Professors and the Vice-Chancellor—such fears are, he thinks, nugatory. He adds some weighty words from an anonymous friend, who says, 'we carefully imbue the minds of the young with heathenism; we then add Schools where the text-books are notoriously sceptical; while we wrap Divinity up in a napkin lest it should get soiled! Did God intend this to be our course?'

It is impossible to deny the force of these arguments. It is equally impossible to believe that the author's *sine quâ non* will be preserved, or of much importance if preserved, when the connexion of the Universities with the Church is swept away. The fate of that connexion is even now trembling in the balance. To some, indeed, the prospect of a 'godless University' affords an argument for firmly planting the Theological Faculty without delay. If religion is to be dissociated from University acts, let it at least find a home, they say, in one corner of the system. It is not what they desire that a place of education should be turned into a battle-field for Christianity; but if it

it is to be so, let Theology be placed in a position where she may use her weapons. These are the sort of arguments which are used at Oxford, and will probably find their way to Cambridge. It is not for us to decide between the present advantage and the future danger, but only to hope that when this new School is established it may be attended with all the good its promoters desire, and as long as possible preserved from the evils which some anxiously foresee.

It is, however, right to state that, with or without a new School of Theology, there are other ways of promoting Theological study. There are certain 'Hulmian Exhibitions' at Brasenose College, Oxford, which provide a handsome income and allowance for books for a certain number of men intending to take Holy Orders during a period of four years' residence at the University. These are given to the most deserving candidates in the College after Moderations, and have proved an excellent institution. The expansion of the plan would provide a body of Theological students who might be bound to show proof of study in various ways. Again, there is nothing to prevent, but everything to encourage, independent Masters of Arts or Doctors of Divinity from gathering together Theological students, Bachelors, and senior Undergraduates, in private houses, or even building halls for them where Theological study and habits of life suitable to their calling might be the rule, and from whence clergymen might go forth armed with all that Professors could teach or great libraries supply. Further still, the lectures of the Divinity Professors, now, as Mr. Burgon says, so much less useful than they ought to be, might, without a single other change, be rendered valuable by a simple expedient, if the Bishops would agree with the Professors to insist on the certificate of mere attendance at lectures being accompanied by one which showed the candidate had passed an examination before the Professor to test his attention to the lectures. No doubt the Professors would consent, for it can only be distressing to them to lecture to gaping youths. The thing would soon grow into a system, and part of the present ground of complaint would be cut away.

Mr. Burgon's eloquent pamphlet has taken us to Oxford; but the same remarks apply exactly to Cambridge, where the so-called 'voluntary' examination is very far from having established any reputation, and where the systematic study of the subject is certainly no more developed than at the sister University.

The arguments used above involve, on both sides, the question of the 'Abolition of Tests.' As this branch of University Reform is now prominently before the public, we must say a few

few words upon it, though it would require not only a whole article but a book to treat it as it deserves. The most obvious remark upon it is, that those who clamour for this 'Reform' altogether neglect to grapple with the real question how a Revealed Religion can possibly exercise its beneficent influence over the heart, mind, and conscience of young men in a place of education (to the teaching of which their parents and guardians entrust them in the hope of their principles being protected and strengthened), unless that Revealed Religion is taught as the authoritative system of teachers and learners. They take no account of a Babel of religions from Romanism to Comtism, all *alike* claiming allegiance from youths of tender age. They do not venture to dissect the German experience of the last half century. They think it sufficient to point to the proved impossibility of keeping the wolf out of the fold even now, to the existence of unbelief amongst those who are bound by Christian tests; but they say nothing about the obvious reply that persons who, having signed Christian tests, have so far seared their consciences that they can hold emoluments and teach youth, after having renounced what they have sworn to hold (or while only continuing to hold it in some non-natural sense), are in a false position. But this is, in truth, the whole point. No such hollow, unreal teaching can stand. The English mind revolts from it as soon as understood. It may influence a generation or two of University youth, but it cannot last after it is exposed, or as soon as any life and vigour are breathed into the teaching of the authorised guides.

If these persons mean that English Churchmen are afraid of 'free thought,' they are quite in error. They must have forgotten history. English Divines have beaten it out of the field with its own weapons, and driven it to take refuge in France and Germany, from whence it has never ceased to attempt to make its way back. But we are talking of places whose 'direct function is education,'* and we denounce as a cruel and wicked policy that which would plant young men, fresh from school, in the midst of a system which must leave its mark upon them for much more evil than good. Is the nation set upon this change? We believe the contrary. Denominational education is the principle of Romanists and of great masses of Nonconformists, held by them as strongly as by English Churchmen, and on the same grounds. They may, most inconsistently, clamour for Abolition of Test Bills in the House of Commons; † but if any places

* 'The Reorganisation of the University of Oxford.' By Goldwin Smith.

† People so easily slip into confusion of thought, and so little trouble themselves to

places have a claim to keep their education denominational, it is the old Universities; if in any place there is no doubt what denomination should preside, it is beyond doubt in Oxford and Cambridge.

The truth is that 'free thought' means 'secular education.' Let people say so at once. If they prefer that system, well and good. We believe the English people do not; and that even of those who do very few are so shortsighted, as to be willing to deprive violently of their rights institutions whose history and traditions, aims and benefactions, statutes and by-laws, are one network of interwoven threads, depending on the preservation of those rights. Nor is the so-called concession of leaving the question in Colleges to a majority of the Fellows in any degree admissible. It is most unjust to institutions founded for a particular object, and on the whole doing what the nation requires of them in the spirit and on the principles of that foundation, to place it in the hands of a shifting body, happening to be at any moment in the majority, to change its whole course and destroy the very object of the institution, viz. a religious education.* Is there to be nothing sacred in this ancestral England of ours? If a College is founded to-morrow for the express purpose of giving a religious education on certain principles, how long would our reformers allow it to act as its founders provided? Are they prepared to apply the principle to Romanist and Nonconformist institutions? If not, why not? Is the Church of England—still the Established Church, the Church of the Crown and people—the only body which is to suffer? By what name shall we designate this sort of legislation?

On the principle that 'good wine needs no bush,' these

---

to enquire what words really mean, that it seems probable that much of the facility with which the various measures for abolishing University Tests have been entertained, is due to the odium which has fixed itself on the word 'tests.' This odium may be distinctly traced to the struggles which emancipated Roman Catholics and Dissenters from political restrictions. A moment's reflection would shew what a world of difference lies between the exercise of the franchise and the education of youth at church institutions.

* If any one is deceived by specious assurances that the destruction of the existing provisions connecting the Colleges with the Church will not interfere with College Chapels and religious education, let him for a moment consider what must necessarily be the consequence of, say, eight or ten men of different religions, and with power to do as they please, living in one community. Would the Romanist, the Baptist, the Unitarian, the Comtist, the careless literary man who still called himself a Churchman, but valued peace and quiet above all things, suffer, say, two or three honest Churchmen to continue the Liturgy in the Chapel, and the lectures on Divinity, nay, the common arguments by which morality is now sustained? If the law obliged them to suffer these things, could they have the slightest effect in the midst of the open opposition and contemptuous treatment of the majority? What could ensue but silence? What but a secular education?

reforms

reforms of the educational course have been given the place of honour. If that course becomes what it ought to be, the quacks will soon give up advertising. Some other parts of the machinery, however, require oiling and greasing before the whole will work smoothly enough to settle the question of University Extension by the best of all methods, the desire of all classes of persons to enrol their names. What can we learn from the Germans—what from the Parliamentary Evidence, so often quoted—as to the Tutoriate and Professoriate of Oxford and Cambridge? Certainly not a word which should induce us to weaken in any degree that 'combination of the University and Collegiate systems, which, when properly worked together, affords the condition of an almost perfect University.'—(Sir W. Hamilton's 'Discussions,' p. 480.) But it is clear that, though very great improvements have been made of late years, much yet remains to be done both as to Tutors and Professors.

At both Universities the Professoriate has been a slow development. It took no very important place in their scheme until of late years; but an extraordinary impulse has recently been given to the creation of Professorships, very much in consequence of the University Commissions; and much attention has been drawn to the subject of their appointment, lectures, and place in the system. New Professorships are, in fact, being created at the rate of, at least, one a year at each University. Several departments are, however, still unfilled. There should be a Chair of Ancient History and one of Logic at Cambridge—a Chair of Archæology at Oxford; there should be Chairs of English Literature, Ecclesiastical Law, Palæography, Art, and Architecture at both. We have little doubt that a very short time will see all these Chairs established. The Professors of cognate subjects require also (at Oxford) to be grouped together into Boards, which should have the regulation of their respective studies, along with the Examiners of their school, and subject perhaps to some sort of veto at the hands of the Vice-Chancellor or the University. This would go some way towards raising the position of the Professors and encouraging the formation of the 'learned class,' which the English are told they do not possess. To possess it in the German-University sense is, of course, on the principles already laid down, impossible. Professors are, in England, part of the teaching body. It is best they should remain so. A portion of them will, no doubt, advance the cause of learning by publishing lectures and writing books, over and above their regular work; but the modern University experience of 'learned leisure' is not encouraging.

It is of course plain that the College Tutors at Oxford and Cambridge

Cambridge occupy a position wholly different from that of Professors in Germany, but, in a certain sense, their place in the machinery of education corresponds with that of the 'Extraordinary Professors;' and, when fearful lists of all the lectures given by the whole Professorial staff at foreign Universities are presented for our wonder and humiliation, it would be but fair to add to the list of lectures given by the English Professors those given by the Tutors in every College. They would include, indeed, a far narrower range of subjects; but that is because the English system deliberately prefers teaching young men to know a few things well, than a great many ill; because it prefers 'to make instruction take root in the mind and become a part of it,'* rather than to cultivate the more showy and superficial plan of our neighbours; to form the minds of young men and teach them the way to become masters of science, rather than to be content with informing them in such a way that they would probably believe themselves to be masters of science when they were not.

But it is a necessary part of this excellent system that it should be in thorough working order; and, in spite of the great improvements recently made, there are still some grave deficiencies. Some of these, as we have already said, have been increased and systematized by the too hasty legislation of Parliament. It was no doubt right to throw open Fellowships at Colleges. The objects of the close Fellowships had been long ago fulfilled, and were abused. But the shortsightedness which gave the non-resident Fellow exactly the same permanent life-hold on his Fellowship, gained by success in the Schools at twenty-two or twenty-three, exactly the same emoluments to the close of his days as the resident Fellow who has devoted himself to the service of his College, is really almost incredible.† The short period which has elapsed has been sufficient to bring the evil to a head. As the Universities enlarge, many more teachers are required; but, so many Fellows now-a-days being laymen, they are everywhere but at their posts. There is no reform upon which there is a more general agreement than this.‡ A division

* Dr. Döllinger admits, in the above words, that this is the result of the English system ('Universities Past and Present').

† Many exceptions to this system are found at Cambridge; none at Oxford; but even where the abuse has been to some extent reformed at the former University the conditions of tenure of Fellowships depend far more on celibacy, income, and taking Orders, than on the primary point of usefulness to the College and University. The vice of our greatest public schools is too much reflected at the Universities, viz. the disproportion between the actual number of working teachers and the number of persons to be taught.

‡ *See* Evidence taken by Mr. Ewart's committee *passim*, and 'The Reorganisation of the University of Oxford' (p. 14).

of

of the Fellowships into two species, one terminable after a very short period (which, being quite sufficient to give the character of a prize, would produce plenty of emulation amongst the best men), and not restricted as to celibacy or residence, the other of a greater amount of money-value, carrying a pension, and contingent upon residence and teaching, but not all of them upon celibacy, must immediately take place. The Queen in Council could enable any College to make this reform. If it is not made spontaneously, any new University Commission will doubtless repair the errors of past legislation, and make short work of it.

A great deal has been said about turning these College Tutors into University teachers; but it is impossible to make this transformation without breaking up the Collegiate system; and that *ex hypothesi* must not take place. There is no reason why a limited interchange of Tutors and Undergraduates may not be found useful by Colleges amongst one another. It was proposed by several witnesses in the Evidence above mentioned, and, indeed, these arrangements are already made to some extent at Oxford.*

Examinations and Examiners must occupy us for a moment in connexion with necessary reforms. The system of Examinations will still, it is maintained, and ought to, form the centre round which all else must cluster. The Examiners will still, therefore, retain an importance which has always been indisputable, but has never been indicated at Oxford either by their remuneration or the method of selection. The consequence is that many of the best men refuse the office, and that it falls too much into the hands of very young or inferior men. An immediate reform of the best kind might be made by reducing these two Examinations to one, as at Cambridge. The present sum would not be so inadequate for a single Examination, considering that the increased amount of work at one time would necessitate an increase of the staff. There should also be (at Oxford) a better method of selecting such very important officers than merely by the Vice-Chancellor and Proctors. If these official electors are retained, they should at least be balanced by the Board of Study in each subject.

The evil at Oxford of holding the Examinations twice a year (except the Littlego, which, until turned into a Matriculation Examination, must take place each Term) tells in numerous ways.

* Balliol and New College work with one another in this way. University and Exeter, exchange mathematical lectures. Queen's and St. Edmund Hall, Oriel and St. Mary Hall have, or had some mutual arrangements, and there are other cases of particular tutors being used on a special subject by more than one College.

[illegible] makes up the body of [illegible] Tutors and [illegible] Examiners [illegible] We see that Mr. [illegible] the Summer Term [illegible] Christmas [illegible] a single [illegible] of the Summer [illegible] He would shorten [illegible] Mar. and begin work [illegible] He thus differs from Mr. [illegible] of the length of [illegible] to the weary Tutors of [illegible] amusement for the rest by [illegible] no one can [illegible] in this way at Cambridge than at Oxford.

[illegible] effecting. It will be [illegible] Oxford [illegible] Cambridge [illegible] which there [illegible] improvement. [illegible] the improvement of the [illegible] Fellows, the in- [illegible] the improvement of [illegible] at Oxford of the [illegible] Cambridge [illegible] incumbrances, [illegible] with an energy [illegible] It is a somewhat [illegible] which were care- [illegible] years ago. They may fairly be left [illegible] and [illegible] capable of [illegible] The grievances complained of are mostly [illegible] which [illegible] by his skilful [illegible] Oxford witness. Evidence before Mr. Ewart's Commission [illegible] The attempt to eject from the Oxford Congregation [illegible] three Tutors, Fellows, private Tutors, [illegible] in right of residence, form a part of [illegible] but [illegible] partisans. The fact that [illegible] would be a little [illegible] Not is it necessary [illegible] the Oxford Convocation, [illegible] generally be traced to electioneering disappointments [illegible] to themselves or their friends,

friends, on the part of the persons who first raised it. There is as much reason as ever there was to bring the educated and practical men of the country, who can take a wider view of things than the cliques of Colleges, to bear on the greater questions touching the life of the University. Their instinct is generally right, even on the question of Professors, some of the very best of whom are their selection. As a matter of fact those who come up to vote are mostly those who have taken a useful part in University affairs during residence, and include quite as many laymen as clergymen.

Before closing this criticism of proposed improvements, a word must be said in favour of a modest reform which has been hitherto advocated far too feebly—the adoption of the Continental pronunciation of Latin, and perhaps Greek. It is high time England retreated from the false position in which her insularity placed her on this point centuries ago. It was a curious result of the English Reformation that even the learned languages must not be spoken as they were on the Continent. The Universities should make the first step towards a 'reunion of Christendom' which even Exeter Hall might approve.

But how about University Extension? A conviction that this matter has been dealt with in a spirit of gross exaggeration, and more or less for sectarian and party purposes, absolves us from the necessity for devoting any large amount of space to it. The Evidence in the 'Blue Book' of last session will convince any candid man of this fact. It shows what great efforts the Universities have been making of late years to extend themselves, and how successful those efforts have been. It will suggest how much better it would be to leave them to proceed their own way. The question is now fully before them. If they should decide to establish a body of University students wholly independent of the Colleges they will accept the consequences on their own responsibility, and must be trusted to guard their own acts in the best manner they can. We need not conceal our own opinion that they will make a mistake if, in blind terror of supposed imminent legislation, they give up the connexion of the Colleges, in some form or other, with every student. Should the step be taken, the one duty of all who value the character of the Universities will be to neutralise the evil as much as possible by collecting these University students into Halls and Hostels, where something of the Collegiate system may yet be supplied.

The argument from the disproportion between the revenues of the Universities and Colleges, and the number of students, has been so vehemently urged that it may be worth while to remind people of the real state of the case. These institutions

have hitherto supplied a particular thing—the education of Christian gentlemen, the cultivation of the best cultivated upper and upper-middle classes in the world; and the plain truth is that such an article must cost money. Mere considerations of the price of bread and butter cannot govern a question of this sort. It is a complicated social fact. This education having established its reputation on the basis of the above fact, it is now demanded that precisely the same thing shall be given to other classes of society. By all means admit the claim; but take care that the conditions under which the reputation has been gained are not destroyed in the process of admission. This is the problem—how to assimilate by degrees the new elements; always supposing, by-the-by, that the new elements are ready to come and be assimilated, another problem which time alone can solve.* It is curious to turn, just as the old Universities are being forced (for it is really a moral compulsion against their better judgment) to make a gap by which their Collegiate system may at no distant time be altogether drained off, to the experience of Scotch students, as given by Mr. Lorimer,† a very competent and unsuspicious witness. In speaking of Edinburgh University, as lately as 1854, he says:—

'Here students from the country, particularly those of the humbler class, who for the most part have no other means of making the acquaintance of their fellow-students and of the professors than the arrangements of the University afford them, usually feel themselves as much strangers and aliens at the end of their four years' course as they were at its commencement. Social intercourse and familiar interchange of ideas and sympathies, even for the time being, are here as little fostered by the juxtaposition of the class-room as that of an ordinary city church. In the ordinary case he quits not only the lecture rooms, but the College walls themselves, when his day of toil is ended, without interchanging a dozen words with any one. The poor Edinburgh student celebrates with no songs his passage from the sterility of unconscious boyhood into the rich and leafy summer of his days. In his solitary lodging he pores over the pages which his professor has prescribed for his study, but his newly-found faculties are whetted by no friendly encounter with kindred wits, his affections meet with none of the sympathy for which they yearn. If he is gregarious at all, he shares his intellectual and moral bewilderment with a few of his former schoolfellows from his native village. The new thoughts which he encounters take little hold on a subjective

* It may well be questioned whether any University is likely to be really efficient when the numbers exceed 2000. Oxford and Cambridge are so rapidly filling that they are getting very near that point. It may be better to found new than to over-extend the old.

† 'The Universities of Scotland, Past, Present, and Possible.' (Hamilton, Adams, and Co.) 1854.

nature

nature so feebly stimulated from without, and he goes into the profession (too often the Church) for which he has striven to prepare himself by an amount of self-denial worthy of a martyr, with no better ground of confidence in his qualifications than that self-conceit which solitary mental toil is so apt to engender even in minds originally modest, vigorous, and sane.'

That the proposed students would be taken up in some degree into a system offering many compensations and mitigations of this melancholy existence is no doubt true; but it will require much effort of a high and self-denying kind on the part of those who, we may hope, are prepared to make it, to prevent such a state of things creeping back. The contrast presents the best answer to the objectors lately mentioned. The Edinburgh picture represents the cheapest and simplest thing attainable. The existing Universities of Oxford and Cambridge represent the more expensive and complicated thing. How very cheaply the full advantages of it may be obtained even now, and how little probability there is of any serious deduction from that minimum under any lodging-house system, may be learnt from the quarter to which we have referred before.

One further remark must find a place here on the superiority over the solitary system of all plans, even the humblest, for extending the Universities by means which include the idea of a 'common life.' All such plans must react for good on the Colleges. They involve that closer relationship between seniors and juniors, the want of which has been so often deplored. The unapproachable habits of Heads and Fellows are not what they once were; but there is at all times in Colleges an inevitable tendency to what young men call 'Donnishness.' When, side by side with the Colleges, places spring up where tutors take their meals at the same table with the men, live with them, share their thoughts and their sports, and thus understand them and obtain an influence based on the best foundation, the Colleges will not fail to catch in some degree the infection. Perhaps, too, the modern worship of the Palæstra, if this spirit of fellowship between seniors and juniors were to make more progress, would sooner yield to the claims of the Academy. Certainly the lodging-house system, with its isolation, its sordidness, its reserve, and its espionage, can never help University society out of its difficulties. On the contrary, the introduction of a lower type of student cannot fail to increase them, for it will both widen the breaches of society and afford examples of escape from control. The present type of a University man may not suffer immediate deterioration, but, if the new

new lodging-house importation becomes large and important, that type cannot long remain what it now is.

The position, then, we take up is, that there is not only no necessity, but the greatest danger, in departing from the principles on which the two Universities have hitherto been governed, either as regards their general function, method of teaching, Collegiate system, or connexion with the Church. While freely admitting Nonconformists to their teaching, and providing for poor students of high ability, they must also contrive to retain their position as educators of the clergy and gentry of England. It will be hopeless to retain either if any material change is made in the above respects. The consequences of driving the clergy to seminaries instead of receiving their higher education along with their lay brethren are too patent to require a word in this place; but no one can doubt that, if the Christian character of the education is definitely compromised, such will be the case. The hardship to that vast majority of English parents who at present send their sons to Oxford and Cambridge in full approval of their system, a majority which, if we remember right, Mr. Gladstone lately put at nineteen-twentieths of the whole, must surely commend itself to the most 'liberal' understanding. That those who would be robbed of places of Christian education, descended to them as to others from remote antiquity, should be forced to build and endow other Church Colleges, and possibly Universities, in some other place for their children, must be considered a curious result of enlightened legislation. And this, after the example of Canada and the United States,* they certainly would do. Men may not see at first that this is the real issue, but, a secular system once established, its results must sooner or later open their eyes. The increasing earnestness of Churchmen is not likely to let them quietly acquiesce in the loss of what is dearer to them than any intellectual, social, or pecuniary advantage.

And, after all, for whose satisfaction is this spoliation proposed? Not for English parents in general, either of the upper, middle, or lower classes. They only err in a stolid ignorance of the questions at stake, and appear likely to wake up only when it is too late. It is for the political Dissenters, represented by the Liberation Society, and assisted by those whom Mr. Disraeli

* The Churchmen of eight of the Southern States had made great progress in establishing a University for themselves before the late war. This was entirely destroyed during the struggle. Funds are now being raised in England by the Bishop of Tennessee for the purpose of assisting his impoverished countrymen to re-establish it. No worthier object could engage the sympathies of Englishmen, none more grateful to America.

happily

happily calls the 'Philosophers,' the English 'Academicians' whose handiwork across the Channel our fathers saw; assisted also by Irish Roman Catholics and Scotch Presbyterians. There can be no practical object, no likelihood of any increase in numbers; for neither Romanists nor Nonconformists are numerous enough to fill up the vacancies caused by the exile of the Church gentry and clergy, and in this busy, class-separated, wealthy country few poor men are ever likely to resort to Universities. Another of those checks to University progress which have all but destroyed them at different periods would take place, and it may well be questioned whether it would not be the last.

We have said that the old English Universities strike their roots into every portion of the fabric of English society. It is surely impossible to be too careful how these roots are disturbed. You may merely make a walk by the side of an old avenue, and yet find that in the process some fibres have been destroyed through which, in the next storm, the whole stately line comes headlong to the ground. It is most unwise to be constantly bringing University affairs into Parliament. It is not every railway contractor or successful manufacturer that can form a judgment upon them. A thousand subtle influences escape the observation of the average M.P. University Commissions should be resorted to only at long intervals, and on proof of a reckless resolution to retain manifest abuses. Every effort at self-reform should be encouraged. This is abundantly understood at the Universities. They have free Constitutions. Public opinion acts upon them nowadays with only too free a play.

Suppose some imperfections after all to exist. Who but a doctrinaire expects perfection? The Universities would probably be far less the favourites of the English people than they are if they were perfect. The very irregularity and variety they present has its merits, merits akin to those of some old well-preserved building which tells, in its quaint assemblage of styles, a story of centuries, merits typified with wonderful exactness in the varieties of architecture which Oxford and Cambridge themselves present to the eye. These irregularities and varieties shed the charm of no mere sentimental dream of antiquity. Their mixture of ancient and modern is a true link between the ages, a real union of old England with the new. They present exactly that microcosm into which it is so desirable to introduce young men before entrance into life, a little world of various classes, tastes, habits, and previous education; so that men rub off their angularities by being shaken up in the midst of it, and yet a community sufficiently under the same system to be manageable and safe for those who do not fly from its control in order to indulge

indulge vice. No better preparation for the political life which is the heritage and natural function of Englishmen exists. Some Colleges are Conservative, some Liberal. Some Clubs are formed amongst the men on this principle, and some on that. Life and vigour of all kinds is the predominant feature of the whole.. Who fails to look back on his University life as the happiest portion of his existence? Schools form a connexion with it beforehand, College friends and the duties of Convocation afterwards. What can equal the pleasure with which the care-worn man revisits the scenes of his youth and exchanges reminiscences with old friends at a College gathering? What the pride which such men take in the old place? Surely the statesman cannot afford to ignore the thousand influences which gather round such institutions, so wholesome, so useful to the nation at large. It is by these things societies and peoples are preserved. There are powers in the world beyond the reach of centralisation, symmetry, uniformity, utilitarianism. Wise men will weigh the matter well before they sap the influence of such powers. Would it not be well to apply Lord Melbourne's advice to this case at least, and 'let it alone'?

The two books which we have placed at the foot of our list came out too late to be dealt with in this article. Mr. Arnold, as might be expected, agrees with Mr. Pattison in his admiration of the German system, and he as little appreciates the merits of the English. His account of one result of the system is not, however, encouraging. 'There are of course many idlers; the proportion of students in a German University who really work I have heard estimated at one-third' (p. 229). Now he will find that something like half the men at Oxford and Cambridge read for Honours.* Mr. Pattison reckons the proportion at Oxford at thirty per cent., but then he only includes those who appear in the class-lists, and this is hardly fair.

We have made a reference or two in the foregoing pages to Mr. Goldwin Smith's little treatise, and are glad to find he is sound on the educational function of the Universities, as also that he recommends the special election of Teacher-Fellows on other grounds than mere intellectual eminence. On most other points his opinions are of course widely at variance with those expressed in this article, and may indeed be rather characterized as American than English or German.

* 'Student's Guide for Cambridge,' p. 14.

ART. V.—1. *Cogadh Gaedhil re Gallaibh: The War of the Gaedhil with the Gaill; or the Invasions of Ireland by the Danes and other Norsemen.* The original Irish text, edited, with translation and introduction, by James Henthorn Todd, D.D., M.R.I.A., F.S.A., &c. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London, 1867.

2. *Chronicon Scotorum: A Chronicle of Irish Affairs from the Earliest Times to A.D.* 1135; *with a Supplement containing the Events from* 1141 *to* 1150. Edited, with a translation, by William M. Hennessy, M.R.I.A. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London, 1866.

In the Series of the Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages, or Rerum Britannicarum Medii ævi Scriptores.

LORD ROMILLY'S Irish publications exemplify two sorts of Celtic composition very opposite in style and character, though both belonging, in a rudimentary way, to the domain of history. In their annals the Irish were remarkably dry and succinct: in their historical tales, excessively florid, verbose, and extravagant. Down to the time of Keating there was nothing intermediate; and to this day a well-digested history is wanting. The Master of the Rolls has given us here one example of the first class in the 'Chronicon Scotorum,' and one of the second in the 'War of the Gael and Northmen.' They are fair average samples of the sort of material out of which, with collateral aid from Lives of Saints, Topographical Poems, and the like, the future historian will have to build up his account of the condition of the Irish before the Conquest. In these we see the literature of Ireland much in the same state in which Gregory of Tours may have seen that of Gaul when he commenced his task of giving dignity and consistence to the French story; and we dare say if the question were asked, whether one would rather have Gregory's work or Gregory's material for his work? a considerable number of scholars would prefer the material. Certainly these rude originals have a charm of their own which no historian can hope to preserve in the same freshness, however well he may assimilate their substance into a national history.

The editing of the florid and less exact matter has, by a compensatory division of labour, been assigned to the graver and more mature scholar. Dr. Todd half regrets the selection of a piece so *bizarre* as the 'Wars of the Gael' in some of its aspects must

must be allowed to be; but these are the characteristics of the whole class of compositions to which it belongs, and even the singularities of what seems to us bad taste are not without their interest when we reflect that for many centuries they were the literary fashion of a whole people. Nothing in historical evidence goes further to establish the difference of mental caste between the Irishman and the Norseman than the distinction in this respect between the Bardic Tale and the Saga. A homely directness associates itself with poetical elevation and fire in the Saga: the poetical elevation and fire of the Bardic Tale are obscured by vagueness of detail and exaggeration of expression. This latter characteristic gives a peculiarly weak and bombastical appearance to the Irish composition when clothed in any form of English. The genius of our language is as little adapted to these verbal excesses as is the mind of the English people in accord with the inflations of thought and sentiment which they represent. But the Irish language runs itself by a natural precipitancy into these rhetorical efforts; and hence, to some extent, the power, over a native audience, of florid Irish oratory at the present day, which is, in truth, the same sort of appeal to something innate in the Irish mind, as used to be made by bards and senachies in compositions of the kind now under consideration a thousand years ago.

There is an immense mass of them. The earliest, and, on the whole, the grandest, remains unpublished. It celebrates in an heroic, epic, though inflated manner, an invasion of Ulster by the warriors of Connaught in the pre-Christian times, and is called the 'Tain-bo Cuailgne,' or Cattle Spoil of Quelgny. The last also remains unpublished. It is called by a formidable-looking Irish name signifying the 'Wars of Turlogh,' and relates the conflicts and fortunes of the great native families of Clare from the twelfth to the middle of the fifteenth century. It is the work of a family bard of the O'Briens, finished A.D. 1459. The better part of a thousand years had probably elapsed between the composition of these two historical romances; but in structure, and in all the peculiarities of taste and treatment, they are similar. Several of the intermediate ones have, through the exertions mainly of Dr. Todd, been published by the Irish Archæological and Celtic Societies. The 'Battle of Moyrath,' is one of these, and may be referred to as a characteristic example. The English is dry, bald, and ill-accommodated to the profuse fluency of the original; but through all its disadvantages there shines a barbaric splendour, and even a certain nobleness, of the effect of which, when unimpeded by a discordant verbal vehicle, on a native auditory, it is difficult to form an adequate conception. The subject

subject is a great struggle in which the remnant of the bardic and pagan powers arrayed themselves unavailingly against the recently Christianised central authority in the seventh century. The work, at whatever time it was first composed, had probably undergone many alterations before the period to which its present text belongs, including no doubt abundant additions to the florid passages, in accordance with the increasing depravity of taste in that respect. This increase is evidenced by comparing earlier fragments with corresponding passages in the later text. A similar process has enabled Dr. Todd to point out that the 'War of the Gael and Gaul' wore a somewhat less meretricious dress than at present when it issued from the hands of its original composer.

It appears that an ecclesiastic of Kildare, when the too famous Dermot Macmurrogh was a boy, had compiled for that young prince's use a kind of cyclopædia or repertory of native pieces of literature, the greater portion of which is still in existence in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and is known as the 'Book of Leinster.' Among other tracts for the entertainment and instruction of young Dermot, this collection comprised a copy of the 'War of the Gaels and Gauls.' Here it is to be understood that as some of the continental nations give the name of Welsh to all foreigners, so the Gael of Ireland used to designate externs as 'Gauls:' and in this particular instance the word signifies Norse and Danish foreigners, the work being in effect a poetico-historic narrative of the progress of the Norse invasions of Ireland from their commencement in the beginning of the ninth century down to their termination with the battle of Clontarf in the beginning of the eleventh. The battle of Clontarf is indeed the one great event which it celebrates, all the other matter being introductory and leading up to that culminating point of the story. The 'Book of Leinster,' then, should supply the text as originally composed, or at least with no greater variance than might be due to the corruptions of less than a century. But unfortunately there remains but one folio of this particular portion of its contents. The comparison, however, of that folio with the corresponding matter of the later copies from which Dr. Todd has printed, shows a considerable amount of verbal interpolation, and justifies the belief that originally the vices of verbosity and exaggeration were hardly so great as they now appear.

But, to a considerable extent, they were always t
inflation of style is very peculiarly Irish. The
which it is usually associated they used i
Northern nations; but if we are to look f
epithets of the Irish bardic tale, we mu

sources. In Arabic literature they are to be found even in contemporaneous writing. A lively example of such a similarity, both in taste and feeling and in mode of expression, occurs in a modern book of travel. A Sheikh thus addressed a native tribe when they attacked his guest, a famous African explorer,—

'Ye have sought my guest: you will find him, when you do find him, mighty, protected, the free guest of a free man, who is the son of a free woman who was daughter of a free man, and whose father was a free man, who lavished benefits. . . . . My guest is my honour, and my honour never was in jeopardy: therefore its guest shall never be imperilled. [He enumerates his ancestors.] Such were my ancestors, noblemen, and their guest never died in agony. . . . . War and blows are to be found elsewhere than where ye seek: and wounds—without molesting this man—and long spears, and cuts of swords round about on all sides, and the explosions of cannons hither and thither, like thunders which crash in blasts and reverberations. They consider the death in which men are destroyed,—they count it a garden and a vernal season of noble youths and gallant lads, and mature men who have grown old together in dignity, mounted on sleek, swift horses, steeds, coursers, trained to run, tall piebalds, five-year-olds, tall, fleet, wide-stepping, rapid, apple-rumped, plump, long-boned, strong-in-back-and-neck, Arabian blood-horses,' &c.—(Barth, 'Travels in Central-Africa,' vol. iv. p. 574.)

This ancestral pride, and sense of the obligation of hospitality, and exaltation of the whirl and fury of combat, are genuine traits which Celts and Berserkers would all acknowledge; but the string of epithets at the end is specifically Irish. A passage from the 'War of the Gael' may now be looked at with eyes in some measure prepared for one of these wordy aggregations—verbal kitchen-middens indeed they will at first sight appear, and offal of the vocabulary. It is to be understood that a favourite image for the giddy excitement of the battle is that of a flight of birds as it were wheeling and fluttering about the heads of the champions. The bard is describing the onset at Clontarf:—

'The battalions were now arranged and drawn up on both sides in such order and in such manner that a four-horsed chariot could run from one end to the other of the lines on either side on their heads, so compact were they; and the battalions then made a stout, furious, barbarous, smashing onset on each other. . . . . And it will be one of the wonders of the day of judgment to relate the description of this tremendous onset. And there arose a wild, impetuous, precipitate, furious, dark, frightful, voracious, merciless, combative, contentious, vulture-(flight) screaming and fluttering over their heads. And there arose also the satyrs, and the idiots, and the maniacs of the valleys, and the witches and the goblins, and the destroying demons of the air and of the firmament, and the feeble demoniac phantom host; and they

they were screaming and comparing the valour and combat of both parties.'

The English is, unquestionably, hard to bear, either for the eye or for the understanding. But something has to be considered before declaring the Irish to be equally intolerable. Perfect equivalents for the Irish in sense are excessively difficult to find, and, in sound, are impossible. What seems so bald, jejune, and forced in the translation, really runs on in a liquid, sonorous, and spontaneous effusion in the original. This is owing to a double rhythmical effect of alliteration of consonants and correspondency of vowels, which cannot co-exist in any form of English words carrying equivalent meanings. And in some instances, though they are few, the epithets are made, even in English, to contribute occasional reinforcements of ideas as well as of sound. Take, for example, from the 'Battle of Moyrath,' the descriptive allusion to the cataract at Ballyshannon :—

'The clear-watered, snowy-foamed, ever-roaring, particoloured, bellowing, in-salmon-abounding, beautiful old torrent.'—'The lofty-great, clear-landed, contentious, precipitate, loud-roaring, head-strong, rapid, salmon-ful, sea-monster-ful, varying, in-large-fish-abounding, rapid-flooded, furious-streamed, whirling, in-seal-abounding, royal, and prosperous cataract.'

The resources of the translator here compel him to employ repetitions and tautologies where his original revels in a seemingly inexhaustible variety of expression; and any one familiar with the scene will recognise the force and appositeness of the phrases recalling the open, grassy headlands, the tawny volumes of the river, the seal-haunted sea-abyss at foot, and the frequent flash of the salmon shooting upward through the prone-rolling masses.

Less can be said in excuse of another characteristic of these Bardic Tales. They are throughout infected to an intolerable degree with the vice of exaggeration. The faculty of wonder thus appealed to is the gift of children. The audiences who listened with delight to exploits of heroes who slew their fifties with the right hand and their fifties with the left, and to tales of single combats lasting through a week, were far from the estate of men in intellectual growth. But such excesses are of a kind so conventional as to be easily distinguished from the substance of the narrative; and after a little habituation to matter of this sort, the scholar in search of facts, or the philo[illegible] desiring to come at the sources of popular thought [illegible] throws these husks and chaff to one side with [illegible]

These are the peculiar drawbacks on the Irish

In its factiousness and partisanship it shares the common incidents inseparable from the mass of all historic material. The future inquirer into the condition of Europe in the nineteenth century will have to make the same allowances for our leading political writers that we have now to make for this organ of the Dal Gais and panegyrist of Brian Boru. Munster was his France; Kincora his Paris: the rest of Ireland was to him as Austria or Prussia. Measured by the temptations of his position he was probably not more unfair to the kings of Leinster and Meath than a Parisian politician would be to Frederick William or Francis Joseph. The central authority which once had been exercised more or less effectively from Tara, had suffered a progressive decline from the time the Norsemen first fixed themselves in permanence on the Irish soil. A chief king who could not prevent the presence of a foreign power in his dominions, could ill expect that his sub-kings would respect so questionable a species of authority. Dublin, Limerick, and Waterford, were in the hands of the invaders. If they had not built, they had greatly enlarged and fortified, those cities, and had made their ports the *entrepôts* of an extended commerce. Had they rested content with the possession of those cities and adjoining suburban territories, they might have enjoyed the monopoly of whatever trade the island could support; for the native population were averse to commercial pursuits, cared nothing for city life, and preferred the open field to any fortress. But the Norsemen everywhere played the part of barbarous plunderers and tyrants. They pillaged the churches, and levied intolerable taxes on the laity. Munster in particular was overrun with swarms of these 'sea-belched' and 'wave-vomited' marauders.

'Mumhain was plundered and ravaged on all sides by them, both churches and chieftainries, and they brought them under indescribable oppression and servitude. And such was the oppressiveness of the tribute and rent of the foreigners over all Erinn at large, and generally, that there was a king from them over every territory, and a chief over every chiefery, and an abbot over every church, and a steward over every village, and a soldier in every house: so that none of the men of Erinn had power to give even the milk of his cow, nor as much as the clutch of eggs of one hen in succour or in kindness to an aged man or to a friend, but was forced to preserve them for the foreign steward, or bailiff, or soldier.'

Against these oppressions the native princes sometimes tried to defend themselves by arms, sometimes by treaty and intermarriage. The people of Leinster, sensible, probably, of the advantage of resting on the garrison and fleet of Dublin, *seem* to have reconciled themselves, after a comparatively short struggle,

struggle, to an intimate alliance. It may be noticed of this province that it has always leaned to external connection, owing probably to the Belgic and South-British affinities of its original tribes. Meath made a more successful resistance, distinguished by the capture and drowning of Turgesius. This fierce Pagan quartered his wife Auda on the community of Clonmacnoise, where she used the high altar for her dais. What became of the insolent dame does not appear; but probably when her lord was sunk in Loch Owel she tasted of the same calamities her countryman had inflicted on so many of the wives and daughters of the Gael.

'Many were the blooming, lovely women, and the modest, mild, comely maidens; and the pleasant, noble, stately, blue-eyed young women; and the gentle, well-brought up youths, and the intelligent valiant champions, whom they carried off into oppression and bondage over the broad green sea. *Uchone!* Many and frequent were the bright brilliant eyes that were suffused with tears and dimmed with grief and despair at the separation of son from father, and daughter from mother, and brother from brother, and relations from their race and from their tribe.'

With one intermission of about forty years, this state of things had continued for upwards of a century and a half, when there arose in North Munster a young nobleman destined through a lifetime of toil and danger to achieve the liberation of his country. This was Brian, younger brother of Mahon, son of Kennedy, head of the great Sept or kindred of the Dal Gais * of Borumha. These patrician warriors dwelt about Killaloe, on the borders of the rough tract of country now constituting the north of Clare and south of Galway. The chief's mansion had its name, Kincora, from its vicinity to the Weir-head of Killaloe, and was probably a hall of wood within the earthen ramparts which still overlook the waters of Loch Dreg, as the expanse of the Shannon above Killaloe is called. On Kennedy's death his sons had for a time defended themselves against the power of the foreigners; but after a short experience of the vicissitudes of warfare, Mahon had followed the example of the other chiefs and *reguli* of Munster, and had made terms with the oppressors. Brian, on the contrary, leaving Mahon at Kincora, levied a guerilla warfare against the Danes of the low country, with such success as to expel them into Limerick on the one hand, and Galway on the other: but not without privations and losses which would hav filled a less courageous heart with despair.

* *Dal g'cais, i.e.* the tribe sprung from Cas, son of Olioll t *regulus* of Munster, much noted in Irish chronicles, through whc the right of alternate succession to the throne of that province.

'Great were the hardships and the ruin, the bad food and the bad bedding which they inflicted on him in the wild huts of the desert, on the hard, wet, knotty roots of his own native country; whilst they killed his people, and his trusty officers, and his comrades. Sorrowful (they were) despised, wretched, unpitied, weary; for historians say that the foreigners cut off his people so that he had at last no more than fifteen followers.'

In this strait, Mahon arranged a meeting with Brian, with the design apparently of dissuading him from the continuance of a hopeless contest. But the superior force of will of the younger brother in the course of their conference turned Mahon's thoughts in quite another direction. We are here introduced to a species of composition of frequent occurrence in these Tales. It would appear as if, before the prose text was put together, some of the principal events had already been made the subject of bardic poems; and a metrical dialogue between the brothers is presented to us as part of the narrative. Allowance must be made for the disparity of the languages, and for the difficulty of catching peculiar turns of expression and hints of sentiment. Even in English, however, the piece is not without force and subtlety; and it exemplifies, in a manner not wholly inadequate, the Celtic notion of a dignified colloquy. It is given here with such a re-adjustment of its English dress as serves to preserve, in some measure, the cadences of the original :—

'M. Alone thou comest, O Brian,
That wentest many to warfare;
Not many comest thou home:
Where hast thou left thy people?

B. With the Gauls they slew in combat,
O Mahon, I have left my people,
That partook of my hard marchings a-field;
Not as thy people, O Mahon.

M. In what battles, O hero,
O my brother, hast thou left them?
If brave have been your fight on the field,
It shall not be I who will reproach your losses.

B. I have left them on the steeps of Craig Liath,
In the gap of the shield-cleaving encounter,
Where fell, with his host,
One hard to be cut down, the valiant Biorn.

I have left them on the rocks of Brentir,
On the ever-enduring stones of Burren,
Where fell, in hard fight,
With forty warriors, the warrior Audunn.

I have

I have left them on the banks of Forgus,
Where side and side at eve were weary,
Where fell, with thirty chiefs,
In fight not soft, the champion Eylfr.'

And so he goes on enumerating his battles, hardships, and escapes: —then adds with mild severity,

'For wealth and ease, would never Kennedy,
Would never, for wealth's sake, the abounding Lorcan,
As thou, O Mahon, have remained
Towards the oppressive Gauls, quiescent.

M. This is thy pride of mind, my brother,
And noble courage not considerate;
Thou carest not for wealth or ease,
And lo, alone thou comest, O Brian,
Alone!'

Nevertheless the appeal to ancestral pride, and the stimulus of the reproachful comparison had their effect. Mahon called together the tribe, and put them the question, War or no war with the Danes? 'Then they all answered, both old and young, that they preferred meeting death and destruction in defending the freedom of their patrimony, rather than submit to the tyranny and oppression of the pirates.' They were joined by all the men of the Sept of Dal Cais who had taken service with other kings; and their united forces resolved to fight the invaders on their patrimonial soil of Cashel. They chose Sulcoit (now Sulloghed, near the well-known Dundrum Junction), a spot famous for the defeat given there to Cuchullin by Curoi, in the old heroic times, as the place where they would measure their arms with the Norsemen. Ivar, the Danish ruler of Limerick, was not slow to accept the battle. It endured from sun-rise to mid-day with equal fortune; but with the decline of the sun the Danish fortunes began their downward course; and at even-tide the 'ditches, and the valleys, and the solitudes of the great sweet-flowery plain' (of Limerick) were covered with their fugitives flying from before the faces of the sons of Kennedy, to gain the shelter of their fortress on the Shannon. Next morning, fugitives and pursuers entered Limerick together, where the Dal Gais made a great slaughter of the strangers. In recounting the plunder, stress is laid on the saddles, 'beautiful and from over-sea;' the beautifully-woven cloth of all colours and of all kinds; and satins and silken cloth, 'pleasing and variegated, both scarlet and green.' Now began to be meted to the invaders the same measure of calamity which they had so long dealt out to the natives. The whole of the captives were collected on the hills of Saingel. 'Every one of them that was fit for war was killed,

and every one of them that was fit for a slave was enslaved.' Then followed a scene too obscurely described to enable the translator to say what actually was done, beyond this, that some kind of ceremonial, in which the foreign women ranged in a great line in a circle, in a stooped posture, were participators, and which certainly was not Christian, took place on the same Singland hills, as they are now called, for the good of the souls of the slain. Altogether the narrative up to this point is one of the most interesting pieces of clan-history preserved in ancient or modern story. There is nothing in the account of the Fabii more devoted, more heroic. The Irish Casii (as a Latin historian would have called them) were probably in number about equal to the illustrious three hundred and six, all of the same name and family, who marched from Cæso Fabius's door through the Carmental Gate to fight the Veientes some fourteen hundred years before. One hundred and forty lords of *Triochaeds*, or chieferies, were among them when they afterwards assembled at Clontarf; and, as the Gens Fabia — or as the Irish scribe would say, the Dal Faib, if classic antiquity will tolerate that barbarism — were accompanied on their expedition by four thousand vassals and clients; so, no doubt, the march of the patrician descendants of the son of Olioll Olum, from Kincora to Cashel, was attended by many thousand tenants and retainers. Probably, if we could, through the comparatively short space of the nine centuries which have elapsed since Sulcoit (fought A.D. 967), see what were the relations between these Irish lords and their *ceile* and *cleithe*—as their tenants and servitors appear to have been called—it might afford a new light by which to get a clearer insight into the constitution of the Roman Gens, and the nature of the early tie between patron and client, now only visible to us through the mists of more than two thousand years. Was the Roman social institution really, in its foundations, Celtic? Are the resemblances which appear between the civil code and the fragments of old Celtic law preserved by the Irish Vergobraths, or Brehons, evidences of Roman lending and barbarian borrowing, or of the cousinship of germane customs derived, independently, from a common source? Do these tales of heroic impulse and dignified manners truly reflect the native Irish mind; and how is it possible that ever since the days of Shakespeare we have habitually conceived of it as of something irreconcilable with gravity, decorum, and sustained energy? These are some of the questions which will arise in the minds of thoughtful readers, who shall have penetrated so far through its wordy envelope into this history of the wars of the Gaels and *Gauls* of Ireland.

The

The next stage of the narrative presents us with Mahon as King of Munster, and relates, with many circumstances to heighten our abhorrence, the tale of his assassination by his rival, Molloy. Brian succeeds to the crown, and to the blood-feud which he carries out to its deadly issue in the battle of Belach Lechta (A.D. 978), where Molloy pays the penalty of his crime. Then, from end to end of the province the new ruler smote the foreigners in an 'invading, rapid, subjugating, ruthless war.' The alliance, however, of the Irish of Leinster with the Danes of Dublin was not dissolved. They united their forces, and assembling on the borders of Kildare, threatened the newly risen power of the south. Brian marched against them, and finding them at Glen Mama, near Dunlavan, gave them a terrible defeat (A.D. 1000), driving one portion of their broken forces over the mountain to Glendoloch (the Leinster King Malmorha being fain to take refuge in a yew-tree), and pursuing the other to Dublin, which, as at Limerick, after Sulcoit, he entered with the fugitives, burned and plundered. Here were found in vast quantities the long-accumulated spoils of the invaders, together with multitudes of hapless women and youths, who underwent the cruel fate of slavery.

'There was not a winnowing-sheet from Ben-Edair (Howth) to Tigh Duinn in the west of Erinn that had not a foreigner in bondage (employed) on it, nor was there a quern (a hand-mill) without a foreign woman. So that no son of a soldier, or of an officer of the Gael, deigned to put his hand to a flail or to any other labour on earth; nor did a woman deign to put her hands to the grinding of a quern, or to knead a cake, or to wash her clothes, but had a foreign man or a foreign woman to work for them.'

We seem to be transported back to the heroic ages with all their savageness and all their greatness. And, indeed, nothing in antiquity presents a more remarkable picture of primitive manners than the next section of the Tale, which gives the narrative of Brian's progress towards the usurpation of the imperial crown. But into the details we cannot enter here. Suffice it to say, that Malachy, who held the title of Chief King, submitted to him, and that the northern tribes were conquered by his arms.

All usurpations have their excuses in success; and, until within the last hour of his own life, Brian may reasonably have looked forward to the continuance of a strong and prosperous monarchy in the line which he had founded. His son Murrogh was a man of proved valour and mature experience: his grandson Turlogh, a youth distinguished for all princely accomplishments. He, himself, was no mere combatant and spiller of blood. He had attained an honoured and dignified old age in

works of piety and civilisation; in the repair and erection of churches and bridges; in the construction of roads, and the restoration and support of schools.

'"He sent professors and masters to teach wisdom and knowledge, and to buy books beyond the sea and the great ocean; because their writings and their books, in every church and in every sanctuary where they were, were burned and thrown into the water by the plunderers, from the beginning to the end: and Brian himself gave the price of learning and the price of books to every one, separately, who went on this service," so that the bard can say with justice that "his reign, which at the beginning was full of battles, plundering, ravaging, unquiet, at length, at its conclusion, became bright, placid, peaceful, wealthy, festive, banquet-giving, foundation-laying."'

His usurpation apart, he resembles Alfred. Like him, too, he re-established the reign of law, and obtained the conventional renown of having given such security to person and property, that, with some variation from the panegyric of the English chroniclers, a woman could carry a ring of gold on a horse-switch from one end of the island to the other, without molestation. This illustration of the effects of good government, which has served to delight so many ears and hearts in the charming melody of Moore, was an old formula of the bards in immemorial use on such occasions, and last applied, before Brian, to his predecessor Domhnal, the hero of the battle of Moyrah.

The great glory of his career, however, was reserved for its close. The people of Leinster had not forgotten their former alliance with the Danes of Dublin, and the independence which it secured; and sending tribute to Kincora, though it were but three masts from their pine-woods, was grief of heart to them. At length Malmorha, the Leinster King, resolved to take up arms against the old monarch. The Danes of Dublin at once threw themselves into his quarrel, if, indeed, they had not already begun their preparations in anticipation of it. From Northumberland and York, from the Orkneys, from Man, from the coasts of Wales and Cornwall, vikings and soldiers of fortune, on the invitation of Sitric, directed their course to the mouth of the Liffey. Even France and Denmark sent their contingents. We have now reached a stage of the story where the events begin to have less of novelty. The early struggles of Brian, the uprising of the Dal Gais, the victory at Sulcoit and the progress of Brian towards the imperial crown are all subjects hitherto practically unknown outside the narrow circle of those who read the Irish in manuscript. But most educated persons are aware of the fact that on Good Friday, A.D. 1014, the united armies of Leinster

Leinster and the Danes of Dublin, with their foreign auxiliaries, sustained a decisive defeat from the native forces under Brian, and that the aged King lost his own life on that occasion. According to most of the annalists, he was then in his eighty-seventh year, and his son Murrogh, who also fell in the battle, in his sixty-third. We refer those of our readers who may care to know the detail of the organisation and array of the armies on either side, to Dr. Todd's elaborate Introduction, in which he has extracted its historical substance from the bardic text, and collated it with whatever illustrative or explanatory matter his great learning has enabled him to draw from the literature of these islands or of Scandinavia. Some noticeable facts, however, are brought out with great vividness in the bardic text. It seems certain that this was one of the hardest fought battles ever joined. It lasted from high-water in the morning till high-water in the evening, and was fought out in one field by men on foot, and almost wholly in hand-to-hand combat. Many of the Danes wore plate and chain armour; the Irish, as was their custom, had no defensive arms save helmets; but their patricians, and those who matched themselves against the men in mail, carried Danish battle-axes, in addition to their heavy swords, for the purpose of breaking the iron and brass casings of their adversaries. There seems to have been little use of the spear, and neither chariots nor cavalry are mentioned. It appears to have been mainly a work of handy blows, kept up without cessation or flinching for a surprising length of time. In the turgid account of its horrors in the bardic text, mention is made of flakes of hair cut from the heads of the combatants, and blown about the field by a high wind from the sea. The fashion of wearing long hair was then at its height among the Gothic nations. The 'Njal-Saga' has enabled Dr. Todd to give us the personal description of some of the Danish leaders. Of these the most famous is Brodar, by whose hand Brian fell towards the close of the battle. 'Brodar,' says the Saga, 'had been a Christian man, and a mass-deacon by consecration; but he had thrown off his faith and become God's dastard, and now worshipped heathen fiends. He was of all men most skilled in sorcery. He had that coat of mail on which no steel would bite. He was both tall and strong, and had such long locks that he tucked them under his belt. His hair was black.' Plat, another Danish champion, in his combat with Domhnal, the Mormaër or High Steward of Scotland, who fought on the side of Brian, afforded his adversary the opportunity of clutching him by his long hair. The sculptured representations of

of the Irish on their crosses and other works of the period show that the same fashion prevailed amongst them.

After the defeat of the Danes, Brodar, according to the Irish account, roaming the field to seek an escape or sell his life at the best price, came unawares on Brian himself. Brodar found him engaged in prayer, and would have passed him by, even though one of his followers cried 'King, king.' 'No,' said Brodar, 'Priest, priest.' 'By no means,' said the soldier, 'that is the great King Brian.' Brodar then perceiving that it was the King, who had now risen from his cushion or hassock, and had drawn his sword, smote him with a double-bladed axe and slew him, receiving a wound at the same time from Brian. According to the 'Njal-Saga,' Brodar knew the King and where to find him, and cut his way through his guards till he dealt the blow, crying out, 'Now let man tell man that Brodar felled Brian.' Either version is equally inconsistent with the popular idea of the old King having fought at the head of his troops, which, indeed, no man of his years could well be expected to do. After such a day's toil the survivors of both armies must have been greatly scattered and exhausted, and the Irish version, though exaggerated and making the old man in his fall deal the blow of a giant, seems more consistent with what would be likely to occur in the confusion of such a moment.

The incident of Brian being engaged in prayer was well calculated to make a vivid impression on the minds of a people so susceptible to religious impression as the Irish, and has been made the foundation of a high-wrought and rather dramatic section of the composition. In calling it dramatic we do not mean that it goes beyond the form of dialogue constituting part of the narrative. The drama in its proper sense never existed among the Irish. Wherever the power of old Rome penetrated, there the drama has grown up, disguised for a while under the obstruction of mysteries and theological adaptations, but finally taking the form worthy of its great parentage. The remains of the Roman theatres may be seen as far as the extremities of Cornwall and Armorica, but do not exist to the west of that arm of the Atlantic which for so many ages has secured to Ireland its peculiar destination of being the preserve for western Europe of primitive unromanised arts and manners. In this section of the piece, which is obviously of later composition and not to be relied on for historic purposes, Brian, at prayers, interrupts the course of his supplications to demand of his henchman how it goes on the field.

"And

'"And not less loud to me would be the blows in the wood of Coill Tomair if seven companies (of woodcutters) were cutting it down." Brian's cushion is re-adjusted, he prays again, and again interrupts his litany to demand how goes it with the banner of Murrogh. And the attendant said, "It is standing, and many heads around it are falling, and around it is a multitude of trophies and of spoils, and of heads of foreigners." Then the cushion is re-adjusted a second time under Brian, and he sings his psalms and his prayers and his paters, till he asks again how goes it with the battalions on both sides. And the attendant answered and said, "There is not living on the earth one who could distinguish the one of them from the other. For the greater part of the hosts on either side are fallen, and those who are alive are so covered—their heads and legs and garments—with the spatterings of blood, and so confounded together, that a father would not know his own son there." And again he asked how was the banner of Murrogh. The attendant answered, "It is far from him, and has gone through the host westward, and it is stooped and inclining." Brian said, "Erinn declines (with it); yet, nevertheless, so long as the men of Erinn shall see the banner, its valour and its courage shall be upon every man of them." And he renews his religious exercises, and the fighting continued all that time. He asked then of the attendant in what state were the forces. The attendant answered, "They appear to me the same as if the wood of Coill Tomair was on fire, and that seven companies (of woodcutters) had been hewing away its underwood and its young shoots for a month, leaving its stately trees and its immense oaks standing. In such manner are the armies on either side, after the greater part of them have fallen, leaving a few brave men and valiant heroes only standing. And their further condition (the attendant said) is that they are wounded and dismembered and disorganised all around, like the grindings of a mill turning the wrong way, and the foreigners are now defeated, and Murrogh's standard has fallen." "Sad is this news," said Brian; "the honour and valour of Erinn fell when that standard fell."'

The 'Njal-Saga' has been, but on no distinct authority, ascribed to Saemund the Wise, whose period was within the century of Clontarf; but it differs so widely from the Irish bardic tale as to make it very improbable that both should belong to the same age; and, as no part of the Saga is found in any manuscript earlier than the fourteenth century, the inference is very strong that the native piece is the more to be relied on as being nearer the events it relates in point of time as well as of place. The Saga is as characteristic of the early Norse genius as the bardic tale is of the Gaelic. From it Gray derived his noble ode of the 'Fatal Sisters.' And if we compare the rude and savage original with his polished and strong stanzas, we shall see what are the legitimate uses to which some Irish Gray may hereafter convert the crude yet less barbarous

barbarous material supplied by the Irish chronicler. A grim humour is one of the Norse characteristics which we do not discover in the Irish. When the Danes break and are precipitated into the sea 'under the tremendous, hard-hearted pressure with which the Dal Gais and the men of Conacht, and as many as were there of the nobles of Erinn, pursued them,' we discern nothing in the Gaelic picture but tumult and horror. But even in the flight and submersion, the hearty Scandinavian genius displays itself in personal traits, over which no doubt many a laugh had been exchanged among groups of listeners by Icelandic and Norwegian firesides. Thorstein Hallison, while the rest were running headlong in the flight, stopped to tie the thong of his shoe. Kerthialfada (probably a corruption of Toirdelbach, or Turlogh), at the head of the pursuers, struck with so strange an instance of unconcern, demands why he delays. Thorstein answers to the effect that if he were going home that evening to his own good house in Iceland he would use more expedition, and the Irish warrior directly gives him quarter. Rafn the Red, who had already made two pilgrimages to the threshold of the Apostles, when pushed into the river by the press, deemed, as he sunk, and as in such a tumult he well might, that he saw the ministers of hell on every side. 'O Peter, Apostle,' cried Rafn, 'twice has thy dog run afoot to Rome, and a third time will he foot it if thou wilt but put him on the road,' and in virtue of his vow scrambled out of the clutches of his drowning comrades and gained the farther bank. Another characteristic of the Norse genius is its propensity to revel in the ingenuities of various kinds of torture. We shudder at what this Saga relates of the death of Brodar as at what the Olaf-Saga tells of the horrible cruelties with which St. Olaf enforced christianity on the Scandinavian Pagans. Similar traits are found in Gaelic story, but to nothing of the extent of atrocious ingenuity which distinguishes the cruelties of the Norsemen.

The Irish narrative terminates with the disasters which befel the Dal Gais on their homeward march, and the famous proposal of their wounded men to be supported by stakes that they might present a front of battle to their enemies of Ossory; and we may conclude it to have been composed some short time after these events. Such is the material on which Dr. Todd has had to work so as to fit it for a place beside the grave and respectable narratives of such chroniclers as William of Malmesbury, and the other fathers of English history. He has not attempted the task of evolving great historic generalisations; but whatever a patient and laborious scholar could do to settle the text, to separate the fabulous parts from the historic, to marshal the events

events in right chronological sequence, to fix localities, and to show the genealogies and family connections of the principal characters, he has done with the most praiseworthy pains. In the Danish pedigrees in particular he displays a singular amount of learned research, and shows a state of family connection between the invaders and the great native houses which will be new to the best instructed scholars in these obscure provinces of British history. The book is altogether a singular instance of solid learning, devoting itself to the service of a semi-barbarous bardism which half a century ago would have been passed by as unworthy of a scholar's notice. But such, no doubt, appeared the first commentaries on the 'Niebelungen Lied,' when Germany stood in relation to old Teutonic literature as Ireland now does to that of her Gael.

The transition from Dr. Todd's to Mr. Hennessy's volume, brings us into contact with the Gaelic genius in quite a different aspect. It was the business of the bard and story-teller to stimulate the imagination and warm the fancy of his hearers on occasions of festivity. The chronicler's duty was to preserve a simple record of events of a certain degree of importance as they passed over the tablet of the year. It was no part of his business to generalise or speculate. The deaths of personages of distinction should be set down. Hostings, plunderings, homicides of eminent men, synods, conventions, exceptional seasons, were the ordinary *farrago libelli.* In this respect there is not much difference between the early portions of the Saxon chronicle and one of these Irish books of annals. This, taken up by Mr. Hennessy, though called the 'Chronicon Scotorum' was the annual register, so to speak, of the monks of Clonmacnoise in Leinster. In an historic point of view it is valuable as supplying *lacunæ* in other published Irish annals, and giving some particulars of events in the western districts, and even a few in Britain not noticed elsewhere.

'There are numerous references,' says Mr. Hennessy, 'to the affairs of Scotland and Wales, and also to the Cruithne, or Picts. But the Annalist frequently leaves it uncertain whether he refers to the Picts of Scotland or of Ireland. The allusions to the affairs of England are comparatively few, and the events sometimes misplaced by many years. The birth of Beda, for instance, is entered under the year 644, and the composition of his book, "De Natura Rerum," is referred to the year 686, the former event being twenty-eight years ante-dated, and the latter also probably quite as much too early. It would seem that the compiler consulted some ancient work on English history, besides Beda and the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, as some important events recorded *infra*—as, for example, the death of Osirice, son of Albrit, "royal heir of the Saxons," entered under the year A.D. 629—are not found

found in either of these authorities. Many entries of curious interest to the Irish historian, which are not contained in any collection of Irish annals at present available, will be found in the present volume. The reference (A.D. 964=965) to the erection of the Cloigtech, or Round Tower of Tomgraney, in the county of Clare (of which not a vestige now remains), is the earliest allusion extant to the erection of such a structure.'

The entry referred to is sufficiently clear and specific to satisfy any reasonable mind that the lofty and slender ecclesiastical tower of the Irish described by Cambrensis, and still commonly called the *cloig teach*, or bell-house, is not a structure of Pagan times or uses, but a plain church campanile, erected after the taste of the north of Italy, separately from the body of the church, and that within comparatively modern times. It runs as follows:—

'Kal. 964. Cormac Ua-Cellin, of the Ui Fiachrach Aidhne, comarb of Ciaran and Coman, and comarb of Tuaim-greine, by whom the great church of Tuaim-greine and its cloigtech were constructed, sapiens et senex et episcopus quievit in Christo.'

In such a compilation it is difficult to collect a connected sequence of events; and to string together a list of battles, burnings, spoilings, murders, and the other like ordinary materials of an Irish mediæval chronicle would be of little value. It is rather for the purpose of indicating some entries which may interest the general reader that we turn over the pages of Mr. Hennessy's volume. Plagues and mortalities are of frequent occurrence, and many famines; it is observable that the cattle-plagues sometimes concur with seasons of remarkable coldness. Among other pestilences is recorded, at A.D. 985, 'a magical colic brought on by demons in the east of Erinn, which caused a great mortality of people; and they (the demons) were plainly before men's eyes.' Here we seem to have the Eastern idea of the cholera goblin. Frequent notices occur of the changing into blood of the waters of lakes and rivers, of cakes sweating blood and other such phenomena calculated to impress the minds of writers of the cloister. Superstitious terrors are perpetuated by entries of deaths and calamities caused in punishment of the violation of holy men's sanctuaries and privileges. A chieftain plunders Clonmacnoise. He dies of an imposthume: Kiaran had followed him and given him a thrust of his visionary crozier, and so on. The bards who had preceded the ecclesiastics in their sway over the popular conscience, continued down to a late period to claim a like personal sanctity and immunity from secular violence. A poet of great renown in those days, Mac Liag, the family *Ollave* of King Brian himself, and supposed

by some to be the author of the 'War of the Gaels and Gauls,' has a special entry recording his death. 'Mac Liag, that is, Muircertach, Ard-Ollave of Erinn, *optimus homo*, died in Inis-Gaill-duibh on the Sinainn,' and we are then presented with the first quatrain ever composed by this eminent bard. It is truly, in its English dress, a very poor performance, and does not appear to have much more either of moral or metrical point in the original. These bards were satirists as well as panegyrists. Such is the character and office of the *Vhat* in India at the present day; and such were the functions of the bards of Gaul in the time of Diodorus.* 'Some they laud; some they asperse' (βλασφημοῦσιν). Ireland and India seem to be the moral museums where these phases of manners, long expelled from the European area of civilisation, have been longest preserved. Within the present generation, professional poets used to make the circuit of the southern Irish provinces, ready to give a return for good cheer in fulsome adulatory verses, and to avenge any contempt of their pretensions by the most malignant satires. Poet O'Kelly, who fifty or sixty years ago was the terror of the respectable families of Leinster, was but a successor, in a mean way, of Mac Liag and of that great predecessor of their tribe, Atharna, with whose bardic visitation of Leinster is interwoven the tale of the first construction of a bridge at Dublin. Judging by the samples of their satires which have come down to us, including this one of Mac Liag, it is not surprising that repeated efforts should have been made by the old Irish to rid the country of a body so troublesome and so little likely to raise the standard of letters; but between them and the early Irish ecclesiastics there was at all times a certain community of sentiment, as well as a similarity of method in keeping up their pretensions; and to no less distinguished a patron than Saint Columba, the Irish are indebted for the preservation of the order, when threatened with extinction at the synod of Drumkeat. Passing from the cases of individual ecclesiastics to events of general importance in Church government, it is remarkable how brief and meagre are the entries.

'A.D. 714, "The coronal tonsure is received by the community of Hi."

'A.D. 1148, "A synod was assembled at Inis Padraig, along with Maelmaedhoig Ua Morgair, Comarb of Patrick (Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh), and several Bishops. Maelmaedhoig, moreover, proceeded from that synod to confer with the Comarb of Peter (the Pope).

* 'Hist.' lib. v. c. 31.

Maelmaedhoig,

Maelmaedhoig, &c., virgin and scribe, and head of the religion of all Hibernia and Alba [this entry is partly in Latin], and Legate of the Apostolic Innocent, and the man who restored the monastic and canonical rules of the Church of Erinn, ended his life happily in Clairvaux (*hi Clarbull*) when going to confer with the Comarb of Peter."'

Who would suppose that two ecclesiastical revolutions, the latter directly tending to the invitation of the Anglo-Norman power in aid of the Popedom, lie hid under these little notes of occurrences seemingly so ordinary? Beyond the phenomena of the seasons there is little to interest the naturalist. An eruption of strange waters from Slaith Cualann (Great Sugarloaf mountain), with little black fishes, in A.D. 868, and the capture of a monstrous salmon at Limerick, in 1109, are indeed the only noticeable incidents, unless some student of physics, shaken in his loyalty to the name of Newton, should think what follows worthy of serious consideration. One idea which has had a strong and persistent hold of the Gaelic mind was, that excess of mental excitement, especially of the passion of fear, destroyed or counteracted the influence of gravitation. Excessive exaltation of mind arising from religious enthusiasm, whether Christian or Pagan, is alleged to have the same effect. During the times of those epidemics called witchcraft, in the middle ages, the trial by water was grounded on the assumption that the person of one demoniacally possessed could not displace an equal bulk of water; and the test of scales and weights was also in use, prompted by the same popular conviction. The Irish seem to have confined their belief of the capacity of the human body to receive some influence counteractive of gravitation to the case of lunatics, especially when the phrensy was induced by fear. Thus, in the battle of Moyrath, Sweeny, the young King of Dalaraidh, who has provoked the curse of an angry ecclesiastic (the Irish conventional source of all exemplary calamities), is visited on the battle-field with an access of terror which deprives him at once of his senses and of his bodily weight, and he rises like a leaf or a waif in the air, over the heads and helmets of those around him, and so flits, rather than, in the figurative sense of the word, flies, from the field. The battle of Moyrath is said to have been fought in A.D. 636, and certainly the belief may well be accepted as having been, even at that early period, settled in the popular mind; for here, at A.D. 718, in this Chronicle of the Monks of Clonmacnoise, we find the record of a furious battle between the northern and southern Hy Nial, at the hill of Allen, in Kildare, where, together with a great number of kings and chiefs, whose names are

are given, there perished *novem volatiles, i.e. gealta,* that is, nine volatiles or flying-phrenetics, who, in the quaint words of the old translator, 'flyed in the ayre as if they were winged fowle.' As usual, the visitation is consequent on the curse of a religious person, in this case a leper whose cow had been seized by some of the combatants; just as Sweeny in the other tale had incurred the curse of the hermit whose eggs had been appropriated to an unlucky banquet of which he had been partaker. Childish tales, it may be said, of childish times; but the child is father of the man, and as the puerile ages of witchcraft gave the elements of a national literature to Germany, so it is not impossible that from these old nursery tales of a credulous piety, Ireland may yet derive the theses of a manly learning.

Mr. Hennessy, the translator and editor of these annals, appears to have studied in the school of Dr. Todd, towards whom he stands, we should imagine, much in the same position as O'Donovan towards the illustrious Petrie. If Ireland is to reap any real intellectual benefit from the vast work of antiquarian learning accumulated during the last thirty years, comprising above fifty published volumes of substantial matter, not to speak of the collections of manuscripts acquired chiefly by private subscription for the library of the Royal Irish Academy, it is to the memory of Petrie, and to the living labours of Dr. Todd and Dr. Reeves that her gratitude will first offer its acknowledgments. But Petrie and his learned compeers could have achieved little without the official genius which, inspired by him, seized on the opportunity of making the Irish acquainted with themselves, through their own scholars and their own literature; and in future tributes to the merits of the great band of archæologists, the death of the elder of whom has left so sad a blank in the intellectual circles of Dublin, the name of Sir Thomas Larcom will claim a co-ordinate commemoration. To him is mainly due the idea of attaching the loyal classes to the cultivation of native letters, an idea which, if carried out as conceived, would have forestalled Fenianism by infusing educated influences into all its material. So far as the experiment was suffered to proceed, it has been prosecuted with singular devotion by all engaged in it. Assuredly, considering the nature of the material they have had to work on, no men could have applied themselves with greater learning or diligence to a work more calculated to train the native tastes into love of order and habits of accuracy. If the Celtic scholars of Ireland cannot be, in the large sense of the word, historians, they claim the title of antiquaries and archæologists, from whose labours the historian may

may arise hereafter. It is almost the only species of literature now cultivated in Ireland which can properly be called native. The expediency of encouraging the Irish mind to dwell on the past has often been questioned; but the educated classes among whom these tastes prevail have carried the pursuit too far to be now arrested, even were that course desirable. They may reconcile themselves to the necessity of being denizens of a land without a philosophic history, but they will not be condemned to the condition of colonists in a new country destitute of past associations. It is worthy of observation that this sympathy with the native traditions and recollections exists mainly among men who have been nourished on the principles of civil and religious freedom; and that the most persistent efforts to discountenance the cultivation of a national literature have proceeded from a school of economists and politicians, supported by the power of that influential body to whom mental liberty has at all times been distasteful. The generous and philosophic mind of Sir Robert Peel perceived the wisdom of providing intellectual ties of sympathy between the native population and the educated classes; and in founding those colleges, in which it was hoped the youth of the upper middle class would be permitted to acquire the accomplishments of liberal-minded laymen, he erected in each a chair of Celtic literature. The Ordnance Survey Memoir, which would have raised the local history to the level of the local geology and fauna of the island, was abandoned on the representations of an eminent Whig statesman, and no sooner was the guiding hand of the founder withdrawn from the Queen's Colleges than the Irish chairs were abolished. Hence there had arisen among men of independent thought in Ireland a feeling that their culture of the higher and nobler aspirations of citizenship is looked on with disfavour by the ruling classes in England, than which no more fatal sentiment could get possession of the minds of a class who are the legitimate intermediaries between Imperial authority and the popular affections. Then, it must be confessed that the Irish matter had been for a long time presented in a guise so extravagant and fantastic as to provoke a repugnance on the part of English writers, amounting in some organs to a degree of intolerance almost fanatical. The sense of wrong arising from these causes was in full operation in quarters pregnant with mischief, when Lord Romilly, with eminent good sense, and in magnanimous disregard of the prejudices of his day, at once took all ground of complaint out of the mouths of the disaffected, by throwing open our great historical series to Irish contribution, and inviting bard

bard and senachie to sit down at the national table with Alfred and Beda.* We have seen of what kind of stuff the Irish material really is composed; neither so fine as it was boasted to be in the last century, nor so slight and worthless as it has been the fashion of our own time to esteem it, but certainly very original and characteristic, full of the elements of new thought, and not without something of the heroic under its inflated style. Certainly, also, whatever opinion will be entertained of the matter illustrated by the Irish editors, no man of letters will deny them the credit of having executed their portion of the work like good and honest scholars.

ART. VI.—1. *The Pests of the Farm, a manual of plain directions for the extirpation of every description of Vermin and Insects destructive to Vegetation.* By H. D. Richardson. London. 1852.

2. *A Treatise on the Insects most prevalent on Fruit Trees and Garden Produce.* By Joshua Major. London. 1829.

3. *A Treatise on Insects injurious to Gardeners, Foresters, and Farmers.* By Vincent Köllar, with notes by T. O. Westwood, Esq., F.L.S. London. 1840.

4. *Farm Insects, being the Natural History and Economy of the Insects injurious to the Field-crops of Great Britain and Ireland, and also those which infest Barns and Granaries, with suggestions for their destruction.* By John Curtis, F.L.S., illustrated with numerous engravings. Glasgow and London. 1860.

5. *Reports on the Noxious, Beneficial, and other Insects of the State of New York, made to the State Agricultural Society, pursuant to an appropriation for this purpose from the Legislature of the State.* By Asa Fitch, M.D. Albany. 1856—1865.

6. *A Treatise on some of the Insects injurious to Vegetation.* By Thaddeus W. Harris, M.D. New Edition by Flint. Boston. 1862.

7. *The Food, Use and Beauty of British Birds, an Essay, accompanied by a Catalogue of all the British Birds, with notices of*

---

* We gladly avail ourselves of this opportunity to express our grateful thanks to Lord Romilly for the important services he has rendered to historical literature by having set on foot and superintended the invaluable series of Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages. The undertaking has proceeded with unexampled rapidity, and the historian now possesses authentic materials for the history of this country, from the invasion of the Romans to the reign of Henry VIII. This important collection we owe entirely to the public spirit and disinterested labours of Lord Romilly, who has laid all lovers of literature under the deepest obligations.

their

their Food; the result of many hundred examinations of their stomachs during seven years, their geographical distribution and æsthetic value. By C. O. Groom Napier. London. 1865.

IT is a fact well known that various animals in almost every country of the world influence, either for good or evil, the labours of the tiller of the soil; but unfortunately this influence does not often meet with the attention it deserves. That the farmer should be able to discriminate friend from foe is of the highest consequence, for through ignorance of its habits or prejudice against its form, many a useful animal has been sacrificed. We therefore propose to notice some of the various animals which affect either injuriously or beneficially the operations of the agriculturist. In glancing over the British fauna in relation to this subject, we shall notice chiefly such animals as are familiar to ordinary observers, and shall discuss the question solely as it affects the interests of the farmer. The naturalist is disposed to lament the extermination of any species, the sportsman is especially interested in the preservation of game and the extinction of animals likely to diminish his supply, the agriculturist naturally considers the matter solely in the light of utility to himself.

Animals affect the agriculturist in many different ways, their influences having reference to his crops or to his stock. Under the first head they may attack his growing crops or his stored grain and fruit, under the second head they may affect his live stock or certain stored provisions as cheese and bacon. The different orders and families of the British fauna vary considerably in their relations to the products of the farm or garden, some being thorough enemies, others only partially so, others again being undoubted friends.

Beginning then with the mammalia, the Cheiropterous or bat family must be considered in our own country at least as valuable friends, all the native species belonging to the insectivorous division. Fortunately for the British farmer the frugivorous section is entirely unrepresented in these isles; for in countries where fruit-eating bats are found, much serious damage is done. The roussette (*Pteropus rubricollis*) of the Cape of Good Hope, the red-naped kalong (*P. funereus*) of Australia, the great kalong of Java (*P. Javanicus*) often do incalculable damage. They pass the day in sleep, hanging motionless on the branches and trunks of trees; but soon after sunset off they start on their nocturnal search for food, which consists of fruit of all kinds, from the abundant cocoa-nut to the delicate and much-prized mango. The bats of our own country are, as we have said, entirely

entirely insectivorous, feeding principally upon various species of gnats and nocturnal lepidoptera; and as obnoxious insects are beyond all comparison the most serious enemies that the agriculturist meets with, it is highly desirable to protect such animals as make these their food. It may be said that the bats of our own country are seldom molested: this may be generally true, but we have known of cases where wanton farm-lads have hunted out these useful little creatures from under sheltered places in old buildings, cart-sheds, and hay-lofts, and destroyed them without mercy. During the winter bats congregate together for the sake of warmth, and pass their time in a semi-dormant state in places often readily accessible to farm-lads. Bats are friends to the agriculturist, and ought to be encouraged and protected.

Passing from the *Cheiroptera* we come to the *Insectivorous* order of carnivorous quadrupeds; the first that suggests itself to our notice is the hedgehog (*Erinaceus Europæus*) or common urchin of our lanes and hedge-rows. Very foolish and extraordinary stories have been told of this useful animal, and so much prejudice thereby created, that it is frequently made a victim of cruel persecution. Pliny asserts that when hedgehogs wish to lay up food for the winter, they roll themselves on apples and pierce them with their quills, and thus carry them off to their holes; but, notwithstanding the assertion of Blumenbach, who was assured this was fact by three credible witnesses, there can be little doubt the story is without foundation. A more ridiculous belief current amongst the country people of modern England assigns to the hedgehog the propensity of sucking cows as they lie out in the fields. Where this opinion first sprung up we have not been able to discover: it does not appear amongst the writings of the ancient Greek and Roman naturalists; but it is astonishing to find it entirely credited by many farmers of this nineteenth century. Hedgehogs have been accused of robbing the nests of partridges and pheasants, and eating their eggs. On this point there is difference of opinion. Sir William Jardine states that hedgehogs do considerable mischief by destroying game in the breeding season, and that they will even enter a hen-house, turn the hen off her nest, and devour the eggs. Mr. H. D. Richardson, in his book on 'The Pests of the Farm,' thinks Sir W. Jardine 'lends himself very inconsiderately to the notion that hedgehogs will eat eggs.' 'We have had them breed,' he says, 'amongst the places where hens were laying, and no loss of eggs ever ensued. Our farm used swarm with them, and at that time it was comparatively from slugs and snails. Since they have been scared awa

have had several crops much damaged by snails and slugs.' In considering the desirability of destroying or preserving certain of our wild animals we must discover, not simply the injury caused by them, but whether such injury is or is not compensated by the good they do. If the balance lie in favour of the benefit any animal confers, then it is a suicidal act in the farmer to endeavour to exterminate it; if, on the other hand, the injury an animal commits out-balance the good it effects, then he must regard it as an enemy and wage war against it. But unfortunately this question is seldom fairly considered, and for this reason, that the injury done, however trifling it may really be, is generally apparent, whilst the benefits, however great, are seldom visible on the surface. For instance, in the case of the hedgehog and its alleged habit of sucking eggs, the evidence is strong if not conclusive against the animal, and the gamekeeper may consider himself justified in waging war against the enemy of his favourite partridges and pheasants; but the farmer will find that the hedgehog, by consuming large quantities of beetles, worms, the larvæ of various destructive insects, wire-worms, field mice, and other vermin, confers upon him a great benefit, and most thoroughly deserves his kind protection. Surely, should an occasional urchin invade the hen-roost, and steal a tender chicken or a fresh egg, such a liberty may be allowed him as a return for the great good he does in the destruction of various insect enemies. Instead, therefore, of baiting these useful animals with terriers—a practice far too common in rural districts, wantonly cruel to dog and hedgehog, and utterly demoralising to all who take part in it—the farmer will serve his own interest far better by giving them every possible encouragement.

Another animal which is almost universally treated as an enemy wherever it is found, is the common mole. To what extent is this animal to be so regarded? The observation which we made above about the small manifest evil and the large unapparent good, holds equally true with the mole as with the hedgehog. The little heaps of earth which this active miner throws up out of its tunnels are palpable enough, but farmers and country gentlemen are not in the habit of considering the economy of wild animals, or of opening their stomachs to ascertain the nature of their food, and thus they entirely overlook most important services, occasionally exaggerate trifling depredations, and consequently arrive at the wrong conclusion—

> 'O fortunati nimium sua si bona nôrint
> Agricolæ!'

The food of the mole consists of earthworms, slugs, cockchaffers,

chaffers, wireworms, and other pests of the farm; the roots of grasses and plantains are occasionally found in its stomach.* Its appetite is enormous, its consumption of food prodigious. The mole-cricket (*Gryllotalpa vulgaris*), so destructive in corn-fields, meadows, and gardens in some parts of England, is eagerly devoured by this little quadruped. Bouché, a German writer on 'Insects injurious to Gardens,' mentions the case of a field containing an endless number of these 'root-worms,' or mole-crickets, which was freed entirely by the moles in two years; and here we may quote the words of a high authority on all agricultural questions:—

'Even your tiny mole,' says Mr. Wren Hoskyns, 'is a ruthless beast of the field—to slugs and snails and caterpillars, and such land-sucking fry—a fierce sub-navigator in his way; but his track turns up some pretty cultivation; it only wants *spreading* far and wide! it's not so wise to throttle him as you think. I grieve to see him hanging gibbeted—his clever paddles stopt, by cruel ignorance. For he's your only granulation master; he taught us drainage and sub-cultivation, and we shall learn of him another and a greater lesson some day, and call him a prophet—when we've done hanging him—and have got some speculation in our own eyes (whose sense is shut at present), instead of saying *he* can't *see*.' †

But it may be said are we to suffer the moles to work in our gardens, throwing up their unsightly mounds, and disturbing our young crops of peas, cabbages, and other vegetables? We reply that we are no advocates for refusing to hold in check any animals in places where their too great increase is the cause of injury, but this is a very different thing from indiscriminate slaughter—so popular amongst farmers generally—with a view to extirpate a whole race. In certain localities a large number of moles may, undoubtedly, do much damage; as, for instance, in mowing grass, where the mounds of earth would interfere with the work of the scythe, and also injure the crop by mixing with the hay. When, again, moles burrow through dams and dykes, they must be held in check; but, as a living naturalist has well said, 'it would be too much to wage war with a whole race for an accidental transgression of a few individuals.' In corn-fields and in gardens we believe that the moles do infinitely more good than mischief by destroying countless myriads of injurious insects, slugs, and wireworms.

* On examination of the contents of eleven moles' stomachs, we found earth-worms, various kinds of larvæ, of which those of *Bibio marci*, or some closely-allied species of *Tipula*, were most abundant, wireworms, and a few centipedes.

† 'Talpa, or the Chronicles of a Clay Farm,' p. 157.

Every one is doubtless acquainted with the form of that little mouse-like creature, the common shrew (*Sorex araneus*, Linn.), with velvety fur, and long prominent snout, so common in our fields. This animal must be enumerated among the farmer's friends. Possessing, like its relative the mole, a rapacious appetite, it does much good by consuming various insects both in their larval and adult stage. Amongst the superstitions of old times this little creature held an unfortunate place. It was seriously believed that the shrew was a formidable enemy to cattle.

Mr. Brand, the author of 'Popular Antiquities,' received from a gentleman at Bideford the following communication:—

'A neighbour of mine, on examining his sheep the other day, found that one of them had entirely lost the use of its hinder parts. On seeing it, I expressed an opinion that the animal must have received a blow across the back, or some other sort of violence, which had injured the spinal marrow, and thus rendered it paralytic; but I was soon given to understand that my remarks only served to prove how little I knew of country affairs, for that the affection of the sheep was nothing uncommon, and that the cause of it was well known, namely, a mouse having crept over its back. I could not but smile at the idea, which my instructor considering as a mark of incredulity, he proceeded very gravely to inform me that I should be convinced of the truth of what he said by the means which he would use to restore the animal, and which were never known to fail. He accordingly despatched his people here and there in quest of a field mouse, and having procured one, he told me that he should carry it to a particular tree at some distance, and inclosing it within a hollow in the trunk, leave it there to perish. He further informed me that he should bring back some of the branches of the tree with him, for the purpose of their being drawn now and then across the sheep's back; and concluded by assuring me, with a very scientific look, that I should soon be convinced of the efficacy of this process, for that, as soon as the poor devoted mouse had yielded up his life, a prey to famine, the sheep would be restored to its former strength and vigour. I can, however, state with certainty that the sheep was not at all benefited by this mysterious sacrifice of the mouse.'*

We have given the above as an instance to show how an idle and ridiculous superstition may create a persecution of a really valuable little friend to agriculture.

Of the badger (*Meles taxus*), once so common in this country, as is evident from many names of places derived from this animal,† we need say but little, seeing that it appears to be

* Brand's 'Pop. Antiq.' iii. p. 293. Bohn's edition.

† As Brockley, Brox-bourne, Broxton or Brockton, Brocklesby, and many others.

gradually

gradually becoming extinct. Worms, beetles, snails, cock-chaffers, wasp-maggots, roots of plants, birds' eggs, and—according to Mr. Charles St. John—young rooks, all enter into the list of this animal's food. The same authority states that 'towards the end of February, whenever the ground is soft, the badgers leave their holes, and wander far and near, digging up the ground like pigs in the fields as well as in the woods.'* In this respect the badger would be no welcome guest upon a farm, though probably the evil would be more than counteracted by the good it would effect in the destruction of noxious insects and slugs.

Weasels, stoats, and polecats, legitimate objects of hatred to the gamekeeper, we are inclined to class amongst the farmer's friends, except where they occur in too close proximity to the dovecote and poultry house. In such localities these determined little carnivora ought to be destroyed, but where they are found remote from farm buildings, in the hedgerows and woods, the farmer, perhaps, will find himself much relieved by their destruction of rats, mice, field-voles, rabbits, and other vermin.

'I am a friend,' says the late Mr. Waterton, 'to the weasel and its congener, the polecat, although I know they will commit depredations on game where an opportunity shall occur. Still, I consider that the havoc which they make among mice and rats far overbalances their transgressions against the game-laws. . . . . That man only who has seen a weasel go into a corn-stack can form a just idea of the horror which its approach causes to the Hanoverians collected there for safety and plunder.'

What we have said of weasels and stoats will, we think, hold good with regard to the fox. Reynard is an insufferable nuisance when he takes to poultry stealing, and his well known thieving propensities, coupled with his sagacity and slyness, render him a fit object of the farmer's wrath. Occasionally he will fancy a dinner of lamb, but it would appear that little comes amiss to the fox; he will kill his own game, or make use of what has been destroyed; he knows well how to steal a rabbit or a rat out of a trap, but is generally too cunning to put his own foot into it. His larder may contain game of all kinds, poultry, and ducks, whether wild or tame. Mr. St. John tells us he is very partial to the flesh of wild duck, and will hunt repeatedly for the maimed ducks around the sides of a pool after a shooting expedition. It is said that he does not disdain to partake of frogs and large insects, and will, when near the shore, beat it for the purpose of picking up fish, mollusca, crustacea, and other

* 'Nat. Hist. and Sport in Moray,' p. 41.

marine

marine animals. Of rabbits Reynard is particularly fond, and kills a large number of these destructive farm pests.

Omitting further notice of the *Carnivora*, let us glance at the *Rodentia*, an order which both specifically and numerically contains more animals injurious to farm interests than are to be found in all the other orders of mammalia put together. The families belonging to this order which are represented in our own country are the *Sciuridæ*, *Muridæ*, *Castoridæ*, and *Leporidæ*. The first named family being represented by only one species, the common squirrel, may be passed over with the shortest notice. The food of the squirrel consists of acorns, nuts, beechmast, the tender buds and shoots of trees, the young cones of the fir and pine, &c. Some of the family, as the grey squirrel (*S. cinereus*) of the United States of America, occasion great damage to the maize and other crops, the sum of 8000*l.* having been paid, according to Pennant, by the State of Pennsylvania alone for one year's destruction of these animals: our own pretty squirrel is seldom found in sufficient numbers to cause any serious mischief to young plantations. The same may be said of the dormouse (*Myoxus avellanarius*), which appears to be a connecting link between the *Sciuridæ* and *Muridæ*. We have never heard of any charge having been made against this beautiful little animal. In the *Muridæ*, or mice family, it would be hard to find a single redeeming quality. The species which occur in this country are the common brown or Norway rat (*Mus decumanus*), the black rat (*Mus rattus*)—now almost extinct, in consequence of his conflicts with his more formidable cousin of Norway—the pretty little harvest mouse (*Mus messorius*), the most diminutive of British mammalia—that builds a round nest about the size of a cricket ball, and suspends it to some corn stem or reed—the common domestic mouse (*Mus musculus*), the most annoying little pest in our houses and barns, and the long-tailed field mouse (*Mus sylvaticus*), so destructive in the corn field and kitchen garden. We are not aware that the tiny harvest mouse occurs anywhere in such numbers as to produce any appreciable effect upon the crops; we may therefore make an exception in his favour. But with respect to all the rest of the species, it may fairly be asserted that the farmer is justified in proclaiming war to the utter extirpation, if possible, of every member. It would be waste of time to speak of the depredations committed by these pests, they are too well known to everybody; but we must remind the farmer that the injuries done by rats and mice in corn ricks can always be prevented. If a farmer lose his corn from the destruction caused by

by these animals, he has simply himself to blame. Provided the corn be always placed upon iron staddles, and nothing be allowed to rest against the stacks so as to afford a communication from the ground to the rick, it is simply impossible for either rats or mice to gain admission.

Of the *Castoridæ* or beaver family of *Rodentia* we have three native species, the water-vole (*Arvicola amphibius*), the field-vole—sometimes called the short-tailed field-mouse (*A. agrestis*)—and the bank-vole (*A. pratensis*). The first-named animal—popularly termed the water-rat—with his round face and bright eyes, his large yellow incisor teeth, and coat of dusky hue, is for the most part harmless to the farmer, though occasionally committing much mischief by riddling the banks of canals and water-courses, gnawing away sluices, and letting the water escape. The field-vole, however, confines his operation to the land, and, in company with the long-tailed field-mouse, often occasions incredible injury to newly-sown fields and young forest-trees. In the years 1813 and 1814 these little pests, by their united exertions, caused so much damage in the New Forest and Forest of Dean by gnawing off the roots of trees, that fear was felt lest the whole stock should be destroyed. Mr. Jesse, in his entertaining 'Gleanings in Natural History,' gives us the following account of their ravages:—

'Extraordinary instances of the rapid increase of mice, and of the injury they sometimes do, occurred a few years ago in the new plantations made, by order of the Crown, in Dean Forest, Gloucestershire, and in the New Forest, Hampshire. Soon after the formation of these plantations a sudden increase of mice took place in them, which threatened destruction to the whole of the young plants. Vast numbers of the trees were killed, the mice having eaten through the roots of five-years-old oaks and chestnuts, generally just below the surface of the ground. Hollies also, which were five or six feet high, were barked round the bottom; and in some instances the mice had got up the tree and were seen feeding on the bark of the upper branches. In the reports made to Government on the subject, it appeared that the roots had been eaten through wherever they obstructed the runs of the mice; but that the bark of the trees constituted their food was ascertained by confining a number of the mice in cages, and supplying them with the fresh roots and bark of trees, when it was found that they fed greedily on the latter, and left the roots untouched. Various plans were devised for their destruction; traps were set, poison laid, and cats turned out, but nothing appeared to lessen their number. It was at last suggested that, if holes were dug, into which the mice might be enticed, their destruction might be effected. Holes therefore were made, about twenty yards asunder, in some of the Dean Forest plantations, being about twelve in each acre of ground. These holes were from

from eighteen to twenty inches in depth, and two feet one way by one and a half the other; and they were much wider at the bottom than at the top, being excavated or hollowed under, so that the animal when once in could not easily get out again. In these holes, at least 30,000 mice were caught in the course of three or four months, that number having been counted out and paid for by the proper officer of the Forest. It was, however, calculated that a much greater number was taken out of the holes by stoats, weasels, kites, hawks, and owls; and also by crows, magpies, jays, &c., after they had been caught. The cats, also, which had been turned out, resorted to these holes to feed upon the mice; and, in one instance, a dog was seen greedily eating them. In another, an owl had so gorged himself, that he was secured by one of the keepers (who of course, we conclude, quickly killed him). As the mice increased in number, so did the birds of prey, of which, at last, there were an incredible number. In addition to the quantity above mentioned, a great many mice were destroyed in traps, by poison, by animals, and birds; and it was found that in the winter, when their food fell short, they ate each other; so that, in Dean Forest alone, the numbers which were destroyed in various ways could not be calculated at less than one hundred thousand, and in the New Forest the mortality was equally great. These calculations are made from the official weekly returns of the Deputy Surveyors of the Forests and other sources.'—p. 106-7.*

The *Leporidæ*, represented in the British Isles by rabbits and hares, must undoubtedly be placed amongst the farmer's foes. This is generally admitted. The loss to the farmer from the depredations of these animals, when suffered to abound, is always serious, and there is no counterbalancing gain either direct or indirect to the tenant, unless he be allowed the full right to kill them and dispose of them in any way he pleases. Speaking of rabbits, Mr. Richardson remarks:—

'There is not in all the class of animals called game,† one which does half of the harm to the farm that is done by the rabbit. The hare will eat her track, but the rabbit is always nibbling a little corn here and there, and prevents it from coming to maturity for acres together. With swede turnips, with wheat and barley, with seed-fields, they do an amount of damage for which the farmer is scarcely ever compensated. They breed also with such rapidity, that they are the source of continual inflictions, even if carefully kept down. It is not only in the eating of green crops, and so damaging the subsequent grain crops of the farmer, but also by the burrowing in seed-fields, amongst corn and

* At the recent meeting of the British Association at Dundee, Dr. Grierson described the ravages done in certain plantations at Drumlanrig by these field-voles, which could never increase to injurious extents except for the utter destruction of their appointed enemies. The Scottish gamekeepers have succeeded in destroying these appointed enemies. The result of course followed.

† Rabbits, it is well known, are not game in the legal sense of the term.

turnips,

turnips, and in the banks of rivers, that they commit untold depredations. . . . . No apology can be made for these villanous vermin. They are unmitigated pests, and a war of extermination should be waged against them on every piece of enclosed land.'

This we own is strong language; but farmers may now generally congratulate themselves on the liberty allowed them of destroying these pests. Moreover it is only when rabbits exist in large numbers that much damage is done.* The same must be said of hares. Eminently adapted by the structure of its teeth and the whole of its digestive organs for a vegetable diet, the hare, when suffered to abound, commits great havoc by consuming quantities of clover, young wheat and other grain crops.

Summing up the foregoing remarks on the influences on agriculture of the British mammalia, it appears that the Bat family is eminently useful and deserves every encouragement; that the *Insectivoræ*, though certain species may in some instances cause annoyance, are on the whole real friends to the farmer, and should meet with protection; that the *Mustelidæ* or weasel tribe, where they are found remote from farm-buildings and the poultry-yard, should not be the victims of indiscriminate persecution; that probably as much may be said in favour of the Fox as against him; that almost every member of the *Muridæ*, or mouse family, together with the field-vole of the family *Castoridæ*, must be treated as foes; and that both Hares and Rabbits must not be allowed to increase in large numbers.

The power man possesses to control or exterminate creatures whose habits interfere with his own interests is an important subject for contemplation. There can be no doubt that in some instances he is able to annihilate a whole race and blot it out of existence within a definite area. Man's destructive power over many of the terrestrial mammalia is great: if people were harmonious in their opinions, the fox could in the course of some years be exterminated and become as extinct as the wolf, once, we know, so common in England; the hare, the hedgehog, and the squirrel, might all, in course of time, by combined efforts, cease to belong to the British fauna, simply through man's agency. Birds would, for the most part, fall an easy prey; what with poisoned wheat and a premium upon the destruction of eggs and young ones, the feathered race might be almost anni-

* Some little time ago the following extract appeared in a number of the 'Melbourne Argus;' it affords a striking example of the way in which rabbits multiply in favourable localities:—'Eight years ago fourteen rabbits were turned out in Mr. Austin's estate of Barwon Park. The number of their progeny shot last year on this estate was 14,253; and in spite of this destruction, and what goes on outside the estate, they have swarmed over the neighbouring country, and have been found at considerable distances around.'

hilated.

hilated. Man might readily deprive many rivers and ponds of the various kinds of fish. He has only to poison the water by pouring into it the refuse from gas-works, or the washings from lead-mines, and the work of destruction would in a short time be complete. His influence over the few indigenous reptiles would in time materially diminish them. But the lower we descend the scale of creation the greater the difficulty to control numbers. This arises principally from the following reasons:—(1.) The amazing fertility of some creatures. (2.) The inaccessible nature of the places tenanted by them. (3.) Our want of knowledge of the life-history and habits of various animals. With regard to insects, these three considerations are very frequently combined; probably the united efforts of the whole human race would of themselves be insufficient to act as a direct check upon most kinds. But what man cannot do Nature is able to effect. The countless tribes of insects are held in check in a great measure by birds and other animals, while one family of insect is often eminently useful in destroying vast numbers of others. What a wondrous connecting chain links together the long series of living organisms, from lordly man to the smallest animated atom! How mistaken is man in being so ready to interfere with the compensating laws of Nature!

Birds as a class are among the best friends to agriculture which we possess; but it is seldom that their eminent services are acknowledged. On the contrary, they are generally requited by unceasing persecution at the hands of the farmer. People are beginning to grow a little wiser on this subject than they were some years ago, though much might still be done to encourage certain families of these useful creatures. The birds which we proceed to notice are generally looked upon as injurious to the farmer's interests: let us see in each case whether the charge is well founded or not.

Of the raptorial order we will select the kestrel and sparrow-hawk, the white and brown owls, for consideration; and though these birds are considered worthy of death by the gamekeeper, we think there is abundance of evidence to show that they are the farmer's friends. The kestrel (*Falco tinnunculus*) is accused of stealing young chickens, partridges, pheasants, &c. The loss of an occasional bird may be traced to this little hawk; but it is certain that mice and not birds are its chief food. The remains of coleopterous insects and their larvæ have been found in the stomach of the kestrel. Mr. Selby writes:—

'I had the pleasure this summer of seeing the kestrel engaged in an occupation entirely new to me—hawking after cockchaffers late in the evening. I watched him with a glass, and saw him dart through a swarm

swarm of the insects, seize one in each claw, and eat them while flying. He returned to the charge again and again. I ascertained it beyond a doubt, as I afterwards shot him.' *

Mr. Groom Napier, who has paid great attention to the food of various birds, and has examined the contents of their stomachs at different months of the year, under 'Kestrel' writes as follows:—

'FOOD.—Europe: *Jan.*, mice, shrews. Britain: *Feb.*, *Mar.*, mice, shrews. France: *April*, beetles, lizards. Britain: *May*, cockchaffers, blindworms. *June*, insects, mice. *July*, mice, reptiles, young partridges rarely; small birds rarely throughout the year.'

Will not the farmer for the future seek the preservation of so useful a bird?

The sparrow-hawk (*Accipiter nisus*) is a much more dangerous enemy to the farmyard and the keeper's preserves; these hawks are bold, active, vigilant, and destructive, dangerous enemies to small quadrupeds and young birds upon which they subsist, and so daring during the season in which their own nestlings require to be provided with food, as frequently to venture among the out-buildings of the farm-house, where they have been observed to fly low, skim over the poultry-yard, snatch up a chicken, and get off with it in an instant.

Of this bird Mr. Charles St. John thus writes:—'A sparrow-hawk is constantly hunting the birds, and destroying them in the shrubbery . . . . it attacks boldly not only small birds, but house-pigeons, wood-pigeons, partridges, &c. It is extremely destructive to tame pigeons, hunting frequently close to houses. It glides rapidly through the buildings, and carries off a pigeon, though very much heavier than itself.' † But notwithstanding these well sustained charges against the sparrow-hawk, there is much to be said in his favour. Mr. Groom Napier acquaints us with the contents of this bird's stomach:—

'Britain: *Jan.*, larks. *Feb.*, moles. *April*, chickens, lizards. *May*, mice, young game. *June*, slugs, beetles. *July*, Limnæus stagnalis. *Aug.*, slugs, small birds. Europe: *Sept.*, small birds, lizards, and throughout the year.'

It must be remembered that cases of theft from the dovecote and poultry-yard are not very common, while the good the sparrow-hawk does by the destruction of slugs, beetles, and mice, is probably considerable. At any rate we cannot advocate any attempts to exterminate this courageous bird.

---

* See Yarrell's 'British Birds,' i. p. 58.

† 'Natural History and Sport in Moray,' p. 114.

Owls are serviceable to the farmer by destroying large numbers of rats and mice. Besides these animals, their food consists of moles, water-rats, field-voles, beetles, and other insects, young birds, shrews, bats, dormice, frogs, small fish, rabbits, blind-worms, &c. Some of them will occasionally seize a young partridge, pheasant, pigeon, or hare, and carry it to their nests, but such a trespass against the game-laws may well be pardoned in consideration of eminent services. Owls are almost wholly nocturnal in their habits, and in every respect singularly well-adapted for this manner of feeding. An owl's immensely large ears, as Mr. Charles St. John remarks, must enable it to hear the slightest movement of the field-mouse, upon which it chiefly feeds, and its sharply pointed talons contract with a tenacity and closeness unequalled by those of any of the hawk tribe, excepting perhaps the hen-harrier. Again, the soft downy feathers and rounded wings of the owl enable it to flit as noiselessly as a shadow to and fro, as it searches for the quick-eared mouse whom the least sound would at once startle and drive into its hole, out of reach of its deadly enemy. As it is, the mouse feeds on in heedless security, with eyes and nose busily occupied in searching for grains of corn or seeds, and depending on its quickly sensitive ear to warn it of the approach of any danger. The foot of man, or even the tread of a dog or cat, it is sure to hear, but the owl glides quickly and silently round the corner of the hedge or stack (like death—'tacito clam venit illa pede'), and the first intimation which the mouse has of its danger is being clasped in the talons of its devourer.*

Rooks, congregating as they do in large numbers, and feeding heartily, must exert a very decided influence for good or evil on the labours of the agriculturist; it is, therefore, a question of considerable importance to determine whether these birds are friends, or, as some assert, the farmer's greatest plagues. There can be no doubt that rooks will pilfer newly-set potatoes, will consume the freshly sown corn, and that they sometimes indulge in the eggs or young of pheasants, partridges, and fowls, but that the balance is decidedly in their favour we consider a fact beyond dispute.

Mr. St. John has very fairly contrasted the amount of good and evil done by the rook.

'This well-known bird is common in all this district (Gordonstown) shifting its quarters at different seasons in search of food; and immense must be the supply to feed the tens of thousands which are sometimes seen together. Their usual habits are known to most

* 'Nat. Hist. and Sport in Moray,' p. 29.

people;

people; but it is an often-discussed question whether the rook is hurtful or advantageous to the agriculturist. With regard to the mischief done by the rook, the greatest destruction of grain made by it is just as the corn ripens and before it is cut; where the grain is lodged, and at the edges of the fields, it consumes a considerable quantity and destroys more. It also attacks the potatoes, digging up those roots which are least covered with earth. In severe weather and snow it attacks the turnips, and its powerful bill enables it to break easily into the root. It is mischievous also, if allowed to attack the stack-yard, spoiling the stacks by pulling out the straws to get at the grain. The rook is fond of eggs, too, and in some rookeries egg-hunting becomes their common habit, when, from their great numbers, they scarcely allow a pheasant or a partridge to hatch a brood. This bird is also fond of cherries, strawberries, &c. To counterbalance this long list of evil, for many months of the year the rook lives wholly on grubs, caterpillars, &c.; in this way doing an amount of service to the farmer which is quite incalculable, destroying his greatest and most insidious enemy. In districts where rooks have been completely expelled, this has been seen by whole crops of wheat and clover being destroyed by the wire-worm and other enemies, which can only be effectually attacked by birds. When we consider the short time during which rooks feed on grain, and the far longer season during which they live wholly on grubs and such like food, it will be believed by all impartial lookers-on that the rook may be set down rather as the farmer's friend than his enemy. On close observation, when the rook appears to be following the harrows for the purpose of feeding on the newly-sown wheat, it will be found that it is picking up a great quantity of large white grubs, leaving the grain untouched. Amongst its misdemeanors I forgot to mention one—namely, that in severe weather* it often digs up the young wheat just as it begins to sprout above the ground. Where rooks or any other birds increase to an inordinate extent, no doubt they ought to be kept down by destroying part of their eggs or young. When the farmer is much annoyed by their attacks on any particular field, a few shots at them soon drive them elsewhere. But very bad would be the effect of entirely banishing them from any district.'†

Although rooks do occasional damage, they are often the means of preserving whole crops. The caterpillars of the turnip-saw fly—popularly called 'niggers' in some counties—not unfrequently destroy the entire crop of swedes. Mr. Marshall states that on one occasion when these pests were busy

* Whether the season be severe or mild rooks are often to be seen stocking up with their bills the newly-sown grain, but their attacks last only for a short time. Soon after the corn is up they cease their depredations, for the grains become decomposed and no longer worth seeking. An occasional gun-shot, and the employment of one or two boys to drive the rooks away, will prove a sufficient remedy against their attacks.

† 'Nat. Hist. and Sport in Moray,' p. 62.

in

in the neighbourhood a large piece of turnips lying in an open field had disappeared in a remarkable manner; it lay near a rookery, and was a general rendezvous for these birds.*

Probably no farm pests more thoroughly deserve the name than the numerous species of the larvæ (wire-worms) of the click beetles (*Elateridæ*). In the farmer's zoology almost every vermiform creeping thing is a wire-worm, but the real wire-worms are the larvæ of the above-mentioned family of beetles. Now let us hear the opinion of Mr. Curtis, a writer who, from long practical acquaintance with the subject of injurious insects, must be considered a very high authority:—

"Amongst the birds, that which stands first and foremost in the ranks is the rook; many a bird is an insect-eater, as he follows the plough and skips to feed upon the wire-worms and other insects, and bird-boys are most invaluable; for if you hoe up the wire-worms and other insects and lay them upon the earth, they will often turn to and begin in a few seconds. Many thousands of the feathered race have full employment of catching them in the ploughed fields, but the form of the bill, combined with the strength and agility of the bird, is well adapted for detaching them in their hiding-places. To pick them up in the growing crops is likewise the occupation of the rook, which, we find, usually surveyes a turnip, or some other field, and seems carefully selecting the sound plants only, which he knows will have consumed the same in search of the grubs and other insects."

A gentleman in Norfolk, who well understands the subject, says:—

"The rook is very fond of the grub of the cockchafer, which it can dig out of the ground, and it is also fond of pulling up the turnips by the roots, and of throwing them aside, so that the crop is left out of the ground, and perished by the sun, leaves, and lack of moisture."

Again, Mr. Curtis thus writes:—

"In the fall, when all the native plants in the country of Norfolk are [illegible] and Mr. Vyse, in his [illegible] of Wiltshire, in which he states that there are [illegible] that [illegible] feed a [illegible] of the [illegible] plants, that nine-tenths of the [illegible] are [illegible] the [illegible] larvæ of the [illegible] and that the [illegible] feeding [illegible] in [illegible] and several species [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible] in [illegible] and [illegible] in their subsistence. Here, then, if any [illegible] to [illegible] the [illegible] rooks

* Curtis's Farm Insects, p. [illegible]. * Ibid. p. [illegible]. † Ibid. [illegible]

quantity

quantity of 468,000 lbs., or 209 tons of worms, insects, and their larvæ destroyed by the rooks of a single rookery in one year. By every one who knows how very destructive to vegetation are the larvæ of the tribes of insects, as well as worms, fed upon by rooks, some slight idea may be formed of the devastation which rooks are the means of preventing.' *

The following is Mr. Groom Napier's list of food found in rooks' crops throughout the year.

'*Jan., Feb.*	seeds, worms, grubs, mice.
March	worms, grubs, larvæ, grain.
April	grubs, grain, seeds, worms.
May	young birds, mice, insects..
June, July	insects, young birds, mice.
Aug., Sept.	insects, mice, slugs.
Oct., Nov.	carrion, worms, mollusca.
Dec.	carrion, worms, grubs.'

That the rook is by no means the farmer's enemy is a lesson our friends in some of the colonies are learning, for live rooks have been imported into New Zealand and Australia at (we believe) 15*s.* a pair. Several other birds, also, are there in request, which in this country are commonly persecuted with nets, traps, poison, and guns.

But of all true friends to the farmer starlings, perhaps, hold one of the most prominent places, on account of their destruction of large quantities of noxious insect larvæ, slugs, &c. The quantity of grubs and caterpillars which even one pair of starlings will convey to their nest is very great. These birds build every year—always unmolested—in the ivy that covers the walls of the writer's house; from one of the bed-room windows distant about a couple of yards from a nest, he has noticed a pair of these birds going and returning with a fat maggot of the heart-and-dart moth (*Agrotis exclamationis*), or a wire-worm almost every five minutes throughout the whole day.

If some of our readers are inclined to think that, from our agricultural point of view, we have been rather hard on the hares and rabbits, we hope to console them somewhat by speaking more favourably of pheasants and partridges. The injury done by the latter bird to the crops may be put down as absolutely *nil.* We do not remember having ever heard a farmer grumble about the partridges. Corn of course they eat, but it is for the most part the fallen grains and the pickings of the stubbles. Mr. St. John says that partridges 'sometimes take to eating turnips even in fine open weather, but cannot commence a hole

* Curtis' 'Farm Insects,' p. 180.

in

in a sound root, only picking small pieces off one already broken by rabbits or rooks.' We suspect this to be a fact of rare occurrence.

Mr. Groom Napier puts the partridge in the same category with the pheasant and the very destructive wood pigeon, and calls them all 'immensely destructive to green and corn crops.' We are sure he is mistaken in this respect. It is certain that partridges are large consumers of insect larvæ, such as those of the turnip-gall weevil, and *tipulæ*. The destructive wire-worms are not uncommonly found in their crops. The partridge's bill of fare, according to Mr. G. Napier, is as follows:—

'Britain: *Jan.*, *Feb.*, berries, leaves, seeds. *March*, *April*, insects, seeds, worms, mollusca. *May*, insects, seeds, leaves. *June*, insects, seeds, berries. *July*, insects, seeds, corn. *August*, insects, corn, green leaves. *Sept.*, corn, insects, berries. *Oct.*, berries, corn, seeds. *Nov.*, *Dec.*, berries, seeds, worms.'

Partridges are very fond of the green blades of young wheat, and eat large quantities of them; their flesh, late in the season, acquiring a peculiar and pleasant flavour from this food; but it cannot be pretended that any mischief is done to the crops in this way. Pheasants, where they abound in immense numbers, do some injury, we allow, but they also render considerable service by their consumption of various insect enemies. The food of the pheasant appears to be of a very varied character, consisting of grain of all kinds, seeds, green leaves, insects, slugs, &c. Yarrell says he has several times seen them pulling down ripe blackberries from a hedge side, and later in the year has seen them fly up into high bushes to pick sloes and haws. Mr. Selby says he has seen them eat the root of the bulbous crow-foot (*Ranunculus bulbosus*), and that this plant forms a great portion of its food during the months of May and June. The pheasant is also useful in devouring the larvæ of *Tipulæ* or crane flies, those long-legged insects popularly known as 'daddy long-legs.' Mr. Milton, of Great Marlborough-street, found in the crop of a cock pheasant 852 of these larvæ; nothing else was discovered excepting a few oak spangles.* A correspondent of the 'Sporting Magazine' writes that no fewer than 1225 of these destructive larvæ were taken from the crop of a hen pheasant in January. 'No doubt,' adds Mr. Curtis, 'these birds pick out the larvæ in corn and turnip fields, and when it is remembered that the almost incredible numbers contained at one time in the stomach only make a single meal, the extent of their services may in some measure be estimated.' We consider that nothing

* 'Farm Insects,' p. 452.

more

more need be added to convince the reader that the arguments against the pheasant are not sufficient to brand it as one of the farmer's foes; on the contrary, we have no hesitation in saying that the pheasant, on account of the food it consumes, is worthy the protection of the game laws.

Woodcocks and snipes are popularly, but very erroneously, said to live on 'suction.' Their food consists of earth-worms, insects, slugs, maggots, mollusca, &c.

Not inferior in point of agricultural utility to any British bird is the common plover or pewit (*Vanellus cristatus*), whose delicious eggs are so well known and highly prized. These birds appear to be getting less common than they used to be, a fact which is much to be lamented, for they are particularly beneficial to the agriculturist by their destruction of immense numbers of noxious creatures.

'On opening the lapwings that have been shot,' says Mr. Curtis, 'their crops were full of wire-worms; and, as it is supposed that one bird would eat a hundred in a day, the flocks of forty, fifty, and upwards, that were constantly to be seen some years since in the marshy districts of our Eastern counties, would clear off a very large number in a season. Their assistance, however, is departed and gone for ever; for the high price which the eggs fetch in the market causes the peasantry to look so carefully after the nests, that the only chance the lapwing has of escaping destruction is to seek the wildest districts of Scotland and Ireland, where, their eggs not being so essential a luxury as they are considered in England, they may escape the persecution they have so long endured.'*

Of wood pigeons we are unable to say anything in defence: great damage is done to the crops where these beautiful but destructive birds abound. The food of the wood pigeon is wholly of a vegetable nature, such as grain of all kinds, seeds, turnip tops, peas, acorns, and the young shoots of clover, to which they sometimes do incredible mischief. The quantity of food which a wood pigeon's crop will contain is quite marvellous; we have taken a large plate-full of turnip tops piled high up from one of these birds. Some years ago there were great complaints in Scotland on account of the damage done by these birds. Their shyness renders it by no means an easy task to lessen their numbers. As man has stepped in to alter the whole course of Nature he must now take the consequences of his act. Magpies, crows, and hawks, were very valuable in keeping down the too rapid increase of wood pigeons, but as ignorance, or prejudice, or selfish interest, has prompted

* 'Farm Insects,' p. 180.

the destruction of the wood pigeon's enemies, the wood pigeon must thrive and the crops suffer.*

The injury that has been done to agriculture by the indiscriminate slaughter of small birds can hardly be exaggerated.

'In one of the eastern departments alone of France, the loss sustained in one year by the depredation of wire-worms was four million francs or 160,000*l.* Had the small birds not been so ruthlessly destroyed, there is every reason to believe that the insect pests would have been so kept in check as to be comparatively harmless. It is calculated and apparently on very good authority, that a pair of sparrows during the season they are feeding their young ones, kill in the course of a week about 3400 caterpillars. Yet farmers and gardeners are so ignorant of their true interests that they annually destroy hundreds and thousands of these feathered guardians of their crops. One Sussex Sparrow Club alone last year [1862] destroyed no less than 7261 of those birds, and a prize was awarded to the most wholesale murderer. In various parts of England also, there is a stuff used called "sparrow and vermin killer," by which large numbers of our most useful small birds are poisoned. One writer mentions that a man, whose trade it is to kill small birds, "showed him with pride about 2000 sparrows, 700 yellow buntings, 600 common buntings, innumerable goldfinches, and linnets by the hundred." Many of these birds, besides destroying insects, also aid the farmer and gardener much by eating the seeds of troublesome weeds, and so prevent their propagation. In Scotland also there has of late years been a crusade against the birds; and in the Carse of Gowrie farmers have offered as much as one penny per head for every adult sparrow sent in to them, and have paid a smaller sum for every sparrow egg. Almost coincident with this virulent attack upon the feathered songsters of our woods and hedgerows, there has been an increase in the insectivorous enemies of the garden and the farm, and during the past two or three years especially whole fields have been devastated by the grub—a foe against which the farmer is next to powerless without his tiny winged allies. That sparrows devour a good deal of grain at times cannot be denied, but the services they render the farmer far more than compensate for the few cereals they pick up. Besides they could be easily scared off the ripening corn by

* A correspondent, writing in the 'Times' of Sept. 14, 1867, fully endorses our remarks on wood-pigeons. He says that in some districts these birds have become so numerous as to amount to little less than a plague, and both proprietors and tenants have been driven to devise some means for their extirpation, but hitherto without success. He refers to the utility of the magpie, jackdaw, and jay in destroying their eggs, and to the terror inspired in wood-pigeons by the appearance of kites, hawks, and buzzards, 'which man in his shortsighted wisdom carefully destroys.' A striking instance of the dread which the pigeon family has of the hawk family came under our observation some years ago. A number of pigeons had been procured for the purpose of showing a little sport (?) in falconry; but the terror-stricken pigeons refused to fly; no sooner did they espie their enemies, the falcons, in the air, than down to earth they came, and sought concealment amongst the crowd of assembled spectators.

a boy,

a boy, about whose rattle and shouting the grub is quite unconcerned. Professor Buckman has recently noticed another service which a small bird, the common tomtit or blue cap, performs for the benefit of the forester, viz., that it destroys the flies which cause the oak-galls, an abnormal growth, threatening ruin to our young oak trees.'—J. R., *June*, 1863.*

All the swallow tribe are immensely beneficial; happily they are not often persecuted.

Of the class *Reptilia* there is occasion to speak only of frogs and toads. These last-named animals are objects of superstitious horror amongst many people, and scarce a country lad throughout the United Kingdom could be found who would not persecute unto death 'the nasty venomous things.' We need hardly say that the poisonous qualities of the toad have been greatly misrepresented. It is true that there are situated upon the back of the animal numerous glands which secrete a substance of an acrid nature. According to the researches of Dr. John Davy this substance, which is neither acid nor alkaline, acts on the tongue like extract of aconite. A chicken inoculated with it, however, received no injury, and it does not appear to be hurtful when absorbed and taken into the system. As a destroyer of noxious insects both the toad and the frog deserve every encouragement:—

'The food of the frog usually consists of various kinds of insects, and of the small species of slug. So voracious are its habits during the whole of the season at which it feeds—for, like other cold-blooded terrestrial animals it passes the cold part of the year in entire abstinence—that it might become a most important assistant to the gardener or the farmer in the destruction of those pests of the respective objects of their culture which I have just named. It will swallow large coleopterous and other insects whole, and will take several of them at a meal. The quantity of insects and of slugs, indeed, which would be destroyed by encouraging these animals, instead of wantonly and unnecessarily persecuting and killing them, would be advantageous to a much greater extent than could at first sight be believed. This consideration ought surely to weigh even with those who are inaccessible to the appeals of humanity, in favour of this innocent and much persecuted race.' †

Of molluscous animals, snails (*Helix*) and slugs (*Limax*, *Agrion*) must be especially noted as injurious to the crops; but the depredations of the different species of snails are insignificant when compared with those caused by the slugs. By the term slug is understood in Zoology those black or brown,

* 'Nat. Hist. and Sport in Moray,' p. 19, note.
† Bell's 'British Reptiles,' p. 93.

thick, slimy, shell-less,* creatures so familiar to everybody; but the word is used amongst farmers in a very vague sense; the caterpillars of two moths of the genus *Agrotis* are often called slugs. Although these pests are not particularly restrictive as to their food, clover, vetches, peas and turnips are their most acceptable diet. Salt scattered over the land at the rate of four or five bushels to the acre, before the crop is sown, is recommended. As these creatures, like the earthworm, cannot stand a sprinkling of salt, but die convulsively from its effect, the remedy should be tried wherever slugs abound.†

We now come to Insects, a class of animals which, from their marvellous fertility, generally baffles all human power to hold them in check. Although locust visitations are happily uncommon in this country, and the farmer may rest secure from the ravages of this awful scourge,—that

> 'Dark continuous cloud
> Of congregated myriads numberless'—

yet there are countless other enemies of a truly formidable nature which the British agriculturist has to contend with, for the most part, it is to be feared, ineffectually.

'The depredations of all classes of living beings together do not nearly approach to the sad and irremediable havoc inflicted by the insect world. . . . It is not only that every crop has its own peculiar insect, but almost every part is attacked more or less in different years, by the peculiar enemy of that portion of the plant. Thus the

* We say 'shell-less' popularly, as it is well known that slugs possess a shell internally.

† Mr. Mechi (see 'Gardener's Chronicle,' Sept. 7, 1867, p. 937) has an interesting letter on the slug-pest, which we subjoin:—

'The slug-pest is this year in full vigour, especially in our clovers, so that there is danger again for our wheat plants. They suffered much last season. I cross-ploughed my clovers just after harvest, and again ploughed them for wheat; so there was no slug; but on five acres of one of the same fields not ploughed twice, a large portion was slug-eaten. As this twice ploughing appears to be a certain cure, I communicate it for the benefit of my brother agriculturists. I suppose the drying of the furrow-slice and the clover within it starves them to death. The first ploughing should be early, and in dry weather. The crop was better where twice ploughed. Liming at night is also beneficial. An intelligent farmer who visited us lately told the bailiff that he never suffered from slug. He well harrowed the clovers in dry weather with sharp harrows, which pulled out the slugs from their hiding-places around the stem of the clover; and the roller, following immediately, crushed them. My young cabbage-plants, after a heavy crop of tares, were literally covered with them. With a lanthorn, about 10 P.M., I counted as many as fourteen on a single leaf; so I sowed about four bushels of fresh-slaked lime per acre, and found them the next day as a shrivelled and dried up chrysalis. A second dressing was also necessary, and my forty ducks early in the morning gorged themselves with any escaped slugs. On the dry earth their trail or track would shine with dried silvery slime. But for these arrangements our crops would be partially destroyed.'

wheat

wheat has a vast mass of enemies in the larvæ of subterranean beetles which consume the roots; it has several varieties of caterpillars which feed on the blade, some maggots which attack the ear, and even when granaried, another which eats out the flour. The bean has the same undermining beetles, the *curculionidæ* when just above ground, a caterpillar in the stem, the dolphin sucking the juices of the head, and the mite devouring the flour in the granaried pulse. The turnip has even more enemies still. If the seed escapes a small weevil, the seed leaves fall a prey to the *flea*-beetle; the root when more mature to the wire-worm and centipede; the leaves to the diamond-back moth and black saw-fly caterpillars as well as those of the turnip butterfly. The cynips make little excrescences in the bulb, while the frost often acts upon and rots it, and a small coleopterous insect devours the green seed of the plant; not to mention worms, slugs, and snails, which assail it in almost every stage. In England and Wales there are between 10,000 and 11,000 species of insects, and more than one half of them feed on vegetables, and rove in vast numbers almost imperceptible to the human eye. Their means of defence are also remarkable. Unprovided with powerful weapons they have wonderful secreting instincts. Some attack under cover of the earth, and may be undermining a crop long before the owner suspects their presence. The mischief can be done before the remedy can be thought of. . . . . The insect can fly and skip with wonderful agility, can semble death and conceal itself among its food so completely as to defy the skill of the observer, for it burrows into the earth almost instantaneously. The numbers of insects are also one vast means of defence. No single handed attack can produce any impression on such vast clouds of aphides as sometimes visit the hops, the beans, and the turnips, unless, as in the case of beans the parts affected can be cut off. It requires an army of opponents to dislodge or destroy them.'*

If farmers could only be persuaded that their most serious enemies are insects; if, instead of attributing the failure of their crops to east winds and 'blight'—a term too vague to convey any definite meaning—they would make more use of their eyes than they are in the habit of doing, they would often be able to determine the exact cause of injury done, and would cease for the future to wage war against their best friends. All the orders into which the insect class has been divided by entomologists contain hurtful species—some orders many more than others—and there is not a single one that is wholly beneficial. Probably no plant has more insect enemies than the turnip; as many as thirty species have been described as affecting the turnip crops, besides millipedes and centipedes. Of the order *Coleoptera* there are about nine which seriously damage and sometimes wholly destroy the crops, about the same number of *Lepidoptera*

* 'Pests of the Farm,' pp. 87-9.

and

and *Diptera*, whose larvæ sometimes do fearful mischief, two or three species of destructive *Aphis*, and one *Hymenopterous* insect. Many of our readers are, no doubt, acquainted with the form of that little jumping beetle, so generally destructive to turnip crops just as the plants put forth their two delicate cotyledonous leaves. This insect (*Haltica nemorum*) is popularly known as 'the fly' in this country; it is, however, no fly, but a beetle. The insect deposits her eggs on the under-side of the rough leaf of the turnip from April to September. The eggs are hatched in ten days, and the larvæ 'immediately begin to eat through the lower skin of the leaf, and to form winding burrows by feeding on the pulp.' They attain their full size in about six days, 'when they desert their burrows, and bury themselves not quite two inches below the surface of the earth, selecting a spot near to the bulb, where the turnip-leaves protect them from wet and drought. In the earth they become immoveable Chrysalides, which are brought to maturity in about a fortnight, when the beetle, or fly as it is called, emerges from its tomb, again to fulfil the laws of nature.' These insects hybernate during the winter months: we have frequently found them under the bark of trees, and in cracks in old railings, and such like sheltering places. With the first warm days of spring they come forth from their hiding-places, ready to attack the various kinds of cruciferous plants which form their principal food. It is quite certain that these little beetles, so destructive to swedes, prefer the leaves of the white turnip. We have noticed where two crops—one of swede, the other of white turnip—have been growing in the same field, that the former has comparatively escaped, whilst the latter has been riddled through and through. Various remedies against the attacks of 'the fly' have been proposed and tried, but, for the most part, without success. The problem may be solved not by considering how we can put the fly out of the reach of the turnip, but how we can put the turnip out of the reach of the fly: rapid growth of the plant induced by propitious weather and stimulating manure is the best security.

One of the most destructive orders of insects is the *Lepidopterous*. Beautiful and harmless as these insects are in their adult or *imago* form, they are, in many of the species, amongst the most destructive to farm products in their larval state. The caterpillars of the common white butterflies, *Papilio brassicæ*, *P. rapæ*, *P. napi*, are all at times very injurious in the field and the garden to turnips and cabbage plants; the larvæ of two species of nocturnal moths do incredible damage every year in some district or another to the swedes, frequently destroying the entire produce of several consecutive sowings by eating off the young tap root

root near the surface. The moths to which we refer are the *Agrotis exclamationis* and the *A. segetum*. The caterpillars are known to farmers in the Midland counties by the name of 'slugs. They are to be found abundantly in the ground as late as November, changing to pupæ in the winter, and appearing as perfect insects about June. Here the birds, especially starlings and rooks, are the farmer's best friends. Salt and soot may be tried with some benefit, perhaps, but the birds will prove the most effectual remedy.

Who is unfamiliar with another insect pest, which from its sudden appearance in countless millions is popularly termed a blight? We refer to the various kinds of aphis, or 'smother fly,' as turnip growers designate this noxious insect. These destructive creatures are found on almost every plant, and upwards of 300 British species have been described. Nor is it cultivated plants alone that they attack, but many kinds of weeds are often found thickly covered with the species peculiar to them. Aphides belong to the *Homopterous* order, and are commonly known as 'plant lice.' Their anomalous mode of reproduction has been long a matter of study to the comparative anatomist, and the recent researches of Balbiani will open out a field for further investigation. Every one is familiar with the stricken appearance of a currant, plum, turnip, or other leaf suffering from the attacks of the Aphis. With its long pointed proboscis it pierces the cuticle, and pumps out the juices of the leaf. In some parts of England, in the autumn of 1865, the swedes suffered terribly from the attacks of the *Aphis brassicæ*. In Shropshire and Staffordshire the effect was very remarkable. Crops that had survived the turnip beetle and the caterpillars of *Agrotis*, and seemed to be thriving, were suddenly attacked by myriads of *Aphis*. In a few days, that which promised so well was hopelessly blighted. The leaves first curled and puckered inwards, then withered and died, and the smell arising therefrom completely tainted the air with a peculiarly offensive odour. Scarcely a green turnip field was to be seen for miles around; nothing but dead leaves, which in the distance gave to the field rather the appearance of a brown fallow than a crop of turnips. Now in such instances as the foregoing, what is to be done? Man is utterly powerless; nor even can the birds produce any appreciable decrease in the numbers. Unfortunately, remedies available on a small scale are impracticable on a large one. We know that our plum and peach leaves can be cleaned of their aphis pests by occasional applications of tobacco water. The hop growers of Kent suffer at times to an enormous extent from the ravages of the *Aphis humuli*, and we believe they can now supply themselves

themselves with tobacco free of duty for this purpose. But how can the remedy answer in turnip fields of thirty or forty acres in extent? Such a phenomenon as was presented by the turnip fields in some of the Midland counties in the autumn of 1865 is fortunately rare. What climatal or other conditions favoured this extraordinary abundance of insects of the aphis family may long remain a mystery; but although we have said that neither man nor bird can produce any appreciable diminution in the numbers of the aphis, we must not suppose that Nature normally allows the unchecked increase of any species of animal. We have seen that the greatest enemies with which the farmer has to do belong to the insect class, yet we must not suppose that this class contains no species beneficial to him. Conspicuous amongst his friends is the family of *Ichneumonidæ*, belonging to the *Hymenopterous* order. Dr. Baird has given a succinct account of this group:—

'The insects of this family are characterised by having a narrow linear body, long vibratile antennæ, veined wings and long slender feet. There are numerous species, the manners and habits of which are well deserving study. As the animal of Egypt known by the name of the ichneumon was supposed to keep down the number of crocodiles, by either destroying their eggs, or leaping down their throat when asleep, and eating their way out through their entrails! so these insects have received the name of ichneumon flies because their larvæ are parasitic upon and help materially to diminish the number of lepidopterous insects which are injurious to man. They seek out the larvæ of these insects, and the females by means of their long ovipositors perforate the skin, and in its substance deposit their eggs. As soon as the young are hatched, which they are in the bodies of their victims, they begin to eat the substance of their host, but avoiding the important organs of the animal, so as not to destroy life before they become full grown themselves. When that period arrives, the larva or caterpillar is left with nothing but its skin. The different species of ichneumons prey upon different species of caterpillars, each species in general selecting its own peculiar species of caterpillar. Sometimes the larva lives long enough to turn into a pupa, but at the time when the last transformation ought to take place, instead of a butterfly comes forth an ichneumon. The ichneumons attack the larvæ of other orders of insects besides lepidoptera. Some of them are very small, such as some of the *Braconides* which deposit their ova in the bodies of the Aphides, and others which infest the larvæ of the wheat-fly, *Cecidomyia*. The clover weevil and the wireworm are likewise subject to their destructive attacks, and such is their activity and address that scarcely any concealment can secure their prey from them. It has been estimated that out of 200 caterpillars of the cabbage-butterfly, apparently full grown, only three butterflies are produced, the remaining 197 turning out ichneumons. It may thus be seen of

of what immense benefit these little creatures are to man as preventing the wholesale destruction of many vegetables which serve him as food. The perfect insects fly with considerable agility amongst trees and plants, especially frequenting the heads of umbelliferous flowers; and some of them emit when handled a powerful and by no means pleasant smell.' *

The prodigious numbers of the *Aphis brassicæ* that destroyed the leaves of the turnips in 1865 called forth a great profusion of a little parasitic ichneumon, (*Ichneumon aphidum*, Linn.) which rendered late but eminent services in checking additional increase. The turnip fields were full of these minute parasites, and any one walking through them would soon have numbers upon his clothes. The effect of an ichneumon upon any species of aphis may readily be seen on the leaf of any field or garden plant. Amongst the green living aphides may be seen several dry, swollen skins, generally of a light brown colour. These bodies are evidently aphides, though so much altered in appearance; there are the head, the legs, and the characteristic anal tubes, but the animal has lost all power of locomotion: within what was once a round sleek body full of sweet honeydew there now lives a small ichneumon maggot. If these objects are taken home and placed under a glass vessel, with facilities for observation, in a few days the following interesting spectacle will be witnessed: upon the back of the aphis there will appear a small round hole, which the enclosed parasite, now ready for emergence in its perfect condition, has made. Through this door the ichneumon fly makes her début into the world of insects, ready to repeat on other aphides the same operation which had been the means of bringing herself into the world.

Dipterous, or two-winged insects, are often the cause of great destruction to the crops. In the autumn and winter of 1865 the swedes which had survived the attacks of the caterpillars and smother-fly were completely and hopelessly destroyed by the larva of a small two-winged insect (*Anthomyia brassicæ*), which tunneled the bulbs in all directions, and ultimately caused them to become rotten. Perhaps this is the most serious of all insect turnip enemies, for there are numerous broods of the maggots during the summer and autumn months, and it is impossible to apply any remedy. Once securely concealed within the bulb, no enemy can harm them.

Every observer of a field of wheat has noticed some of the ears to contain a number of minute maggots of a bright yellow colour. These are the larvæ of the wheat midge (*Cecidomyia tritici*).

* 'Cyclopædia of Natural Sciences,' s. v. 'Ichneumonidæ.'

tritici). * The female deposits her eggs in the ear of wheat about the time of flowering, and the larvæ feed upon the tender grain. They leap out of the glumes to bury themselves and become pupæ in the earth, or are carried into the granary with the corn. The damage done to the corn crops by this little midge is sometimes most serious. Mr. Curtis says that he 'fears the ingenuity of man will never devise any method for the destruction of this little rogue in grain when it has once taken possession of a standing crop.' To apply any remedy when the ears are once inoculated, he thinks impossible. In the pupæ state they can be assailed.

'Professor Henslow's suggestions appear to be the most feasible and best calculated to check their increase, provided the larvæ and pupæ carried into the barn do not die from the artificial state in which they are placed. He recommends the use of a sieve sufficiently open to let the pupæ and larvæ pass through with the dust which must be removed and burned. He says, "It occurred to me that if a wire-gauze sieve were placed before the winnowing machine in a sloping position so as to allow the chaff to fall upon it and then roll from it, the pupæ would pass through and might be caught with the dust in a tray placed below the sieve. I have put this to the test of experiment and find it answer perfectly. Two pieces of wire-gauze were placed together at an angle, sloping like the roof of a house, and the chaff readily fell off on each side to the floor, whilst dust and pupæ passed through. If a simple contrivance of this kind formed an appendage to every winnowing machine in the country, what myriads on myriads of the pupæ might be collected and destroyed. The researches which I have made on the subject since my report was written, have satisfied me that the damage done by this minute insect is much greater than agriculturists are at all aware of.'

The ichneumon flies in this case also prove most valuable friends in checking the increase of the wheat midge. Three species of this family feed parasitically on the larvæ. The most abundant and consequently the most useful of them is the *Platygaster tipulæ*.

'To see our little ichneumon,' says Mr. Kirby, 'deposit its egg in the caterpillar of the wheat fly is a very entertaining sight. In order to enjoy this pleasure, I placed a number of the latter upon a sheet of white paper at no great distance from each other, and then set an ichneumon down in the midst of them. She began immediately to march about, vibrating her antennæ very briskly. A larva was soon discovered, upon which she fixed herself, the vibratory motion of her

* This insect has been long known in this country; in a letter published in the 'Philosophical Transactions' for 1772, it is thus noticed: 'What the farmers call the yellows in wheat, and which they consider as a kind of mildew, is in fact occasioned by a small yellow fly, with blue wings, about the size of a gnat.'

antennæ

antennæ increasing to an intense degree; then bending her body obliquely under her breast, she applied her posterior extremity to the larva, and during the insertion of her *aculeus* and the depositing of the egg, her antennæ became perfectly still and motionless. Whilst this operation was performing, the larva appeared to feel a momentary sensation of pain, for it gave a violent wriggle. When all was finished, the little ichneumon marched off to seek for a second which was obliged to undergo the same operation; and so on to as many as it could find in which no egg had been before deposited, for it commits only a single egg to each larva. I have seen it frequently mount one which had been pricked before, but it soon discovered its mistake and left it. The size of it is so near that of the *Tipula* that I imagine the larva of the latter could not support more than one of the former, and therefore instinct directs it to deposit only a single egg in each; besides, by this means one ichneumon will destroy an infinite number of *larvæ*.' *

The wheat midge is a near relative of the dreadful American scourge, the 'Hessian fly' (*Cecidomyia destructor*), whose larvæ have not unfrequently caused famines in the land of the West.

'The ravages of this insect,' says Mr. Kirby, 'which was first noticed in 1776 and received its name from an erroneous idea that it was carried by the Hessian troops in their straw from Germany, were at one time so universal as to threaten, where it appeared, the total abolition of the culture of wheat. . . . It commences its depredation in autumn, as soon as the plant begins to appear above ground, when it devours the leaf and stem with equal voracity until stopped by the frost. When the return of spring brings a milder temperature the fly appears again and deposits its eggs in the heart of the main stems which it perforates, and so weakens, that when the ear begins to grow heavy, and is about to go into the milky state, they break down and perish. All the crops as far as it extended its flight, fell before the ravager. It first showed itself in Long Island, from whence it proceeded inland at about the rate of fifteen or twenty miles annually, and by the year 1789 had reached 200 miles from its original station. . . . . Nothing intercepts them in their destructive career, neither mountains nor the broadest rivers. They were seen to cross the Delaware like a cloud. The numbers of this fly were so great, that in wheat harvest the houses swarmed with them to the extreme annoyance of the inhabitants. They filled every plate or vessel that was in use; and 500 were counted in a single glass tumbler exposed to them a few minutes with a little beer in it.'†

Fortunately the Hessian fly has a formidable enemy in the

* 'Transactions of the Linnæan Society,' iv. p. 236.

† 'Kirby and Spence's Entomology,' i. 171. 'We hear of this insect at the present time as very destructive in Illinois and some of the contiguous States, the crop in many wheat-fields being totally ruined by it.'—Dr. Fitch in the Seventh Report, p. 134.

Ceraphron

Ceraphron destructor, a species of ichneumon which lays its eggs in the bodies of the larvæ so that few become pupæ, otherwise, as some have thought, the wheat crops would be totally annihilated.

About half a century ago great alarm was felt amongst agriculturists in our own country by the occurrence of immense numbers of what they supposed was the American pest, but which turned out to be a distinct fly,—some species of *Chlorops*.

Wonderful, truly, are the œconomics of Nature, and on the whole beneficial to man. That fearful damage is occasionally done directly and indirectly to the 'lord of creation' by various low forms of animal life is undoubted; that in many cases man's efforts to keep numerous devastating insects under control are inappreciable is also equally certain. Man might as well attempt to stay the tide of the sea as to stay a tide of locusts! Again, every plant useful to man has its own peculiar animal enemies whose attacks at times destroy whole crops of thousands of pounds in value, yet for the most part, if we take a wide view of Nature, and are not too anxious to interfere with her wise laws, we find that disastrous consequences are after all the exceptions. That the injuries effected by various noxious animals would be considerably less than they are if farmers paid more attention to Natural History, or at any rate took the advice of those who have carefully considered the question in its general bearings, we do not scruple to assert.

Besides the various enemies to injurious insects in the shape of ichneumon flies, there are other insect-destroyers which carry off and devour vast numbers of farm-pests. Spiders, wasps and other fossorial *Hymenoptera*, dragon flies, various species of *Empidæ*, lady-bird beetles, the larvæ of the 'golden-eye' or lace-wing fly, the larvæ of the *Syrphidæ*, and many others, are especially worthy of mention. Wasps have few advocates, but we are inclined to think that these active and powerful insects ought to be regarded favourably by the agriculturist. Everybody considers it a positive duty to kill a wasp whenever the opportunity occurs. The injury the wasp does to the ripening fruit is so great that it is no wonder it has made everybody its enemy. But, as we said before, we must look at both sides of the question; we must consider the habits of the wasp not from one point only but from all points, and then perhaps we shall find reason to modify some of our ill feelings with respect to this much-abused insect. 'I it possible,' perhaps the reader will exclaim, 'that any person can argue in favour of a wasp, so fit an em irritability of temper and the greatest rogue in th

What does the wasp feed upon besides fruit and honey? Why, upon various insects, chiefly of the two-winged order, such as house flies and other species of the family of *Muscidæ*. A completed wasp's nest may contain about 16,000 cells, having a wasp-maggot in each. Let us take into account, then, the enormous destruction of other insects which are slain for the purpose of supplying the larvæ with food, for we must remember that wasps feed their children not solely with honey and fruit, but with a mixture of animal and vegetable food. If any observer will stand near a wasp's nest he will be convinced that these insects destroy countless multitudes of others, and that their place in the economy of nature is profitably filled.

'Even the obnoxious and persecuted wasp,' says Mr. Curtis, 'assists in the destruction of other insects upon which it preys, making some amends for robbing our orchards. When at the end of summer the sweet thistle flowers attract a variety of butterflies and swarms of insects, the wasps are busily employed in capturing them, which they do very skilfully. I have many times seen them carry off large flies from the ivy flowers, and even the white butterflies are not too large to deter the wasps from attacking them; the species called *Pontia rapæ*, it seems, is most subject to their assaults, and their mode of securing this butterfly is very curious, as related by Mr. Newport in the "Entomological Transactions." *

'The wasp,' says Mr. Wood, 'is more of a predaceous than a vegetable feeding insect, and kills so many flies that it relieves the gardener of other foes, which in the end would be more injurious than itself, inasmuch as the larva endangers not only the fruit but the very life of the plant. It is a strangely bold insect, and has recourse to singular methods of procuring food. In the farming department at Walton Hall, I have seen the pigs lying in the warm sunshine, the flies clustering thickly on their bodies, and the wasp pouncing on the flies and carrying them off. It was a curious sight to watch the total indifference of the pigs, the busy clustering of the flies, with which the hide was absolutely blackened in some places, and then to see the yellow-bodied wasp just clear the wall, dart into the dark mass, and retreat again with a fly in its fatal grasp. On the average one wasp arrived every ten seconds, so that the pigsty must have been a well known storehouse for these insects.' †

Mr. Wood's remarks suggest the value to the farmer of the wasp in its destruction of two very serious evils that affect sheep; we refer to the Sheep-bot and the Flesh-fly. Both are dipterous insects, the former belonging to the *Œstridæ* or gad-fly family, the latter being one of the *Muscidæ*. The sheep-bot (*Œstrus ovis*) deposits its eggs in the sheep's nostrils, the larvæ crawl

* 'Farm Insects,' p. 103. 'Entom. Trans.,' i. p. 228.
† 'Homes without Hands,' p. 139.

into

into the frontal cavities, occasionally causing vertigo or 'staggers,' which often end in death. The flesh-fly (*Sarcophaga carnaria*) is too well known in its injurious effects to need any remark. Who can say what amount of benefit is conferred upon the farmer's flocks by the wasps in their destruction of these dreaded pests? Of the value of spiders we need say little; spiders, so abundant in every hedge and field and wood, must do considerable service in keeping in check numerous insects injurious to agriculture; but as the farmer wages no war against the spider, the subject may be dismissed. The pretty little lady-bird beetles, familiar to us from our nursery days, are useful in helping to keep under some control the various species of *Aphis*. In the autumn of 1865, we observed immense numbers of the seven-spotted lady-bird (*Coccinella septem-punctata*) on the leaves of the turnips. Under a mistaken opinion that these little beetles were the cause of injury to the crops we found that they were destroyed by some farmers! We saw the beetles with the *aphides* in their mouths. The larvæ of these *Coccinellæ* feed on the plant-lice; their method of attacking the aphides is curious.

'I have seen,' says Mr. Curtis, 'one of these struggling whilst this little insect alligator threw its fore legs around it, and was greatly amused at the skill it exhibited; for fearing that the aphis might escape, it gradually slid along to the wings which were closed, and immediately began to bite them, so that in a very short time they were rendered useless, being matted together; it then returned in triumph to the side of its helpless victim, and seizing the thorax firmly in its grasp, it ate into the side, coolly putting its hind-leg over those of the aphis whose convulsive throbs annoyed its relentless enemy.' *

The larva of the lace-winged fly (*Chrysopa perla*) clothes itself with the skins of its victims, or with scrapings of green and delicate lichens, and lies in ambush for its aphis prey.

It is time to bring this subject to a conclusion. That it is one of great practical importance must, we think, be generally admitted; and that it has not received from agriculturists the careful attention and unbiassed consideration which it deserves, must also be conceded. Questions of this kind are now engaging the attention of the Governments of France and the United States; in our own country they are passed over almost without notice. Country gentlemen know nothing of such topics, and consequently care little about them. The valuable and truly praiseworthy labours of the late John Curtis in

* 'Farm Insects,' p. 72.

this

this little-trodden field of Rural Economy are practically unknown in this country. Why do not our large landed proprietors bestow some few hours upon the study of Economic Natural History? Why do not more of them seek to combine some knowledge of Nature with a love of genuine sport? The late Charles St. John may be recommended as a pattern worthy of imitation. Landed proprietors would then cease to be so zealous for the extermination of certain wild animals, and less likely to believe a one-sided accusation; they would discover some of those interesting phenomena of which Darwin has spoken—'instances showing how plants and animals most remote in the scale of nature are bound together by a web of complex relations.' They would ensure better crops both on their own farms and on those of their tenants.

ART. VII.—1. *Questions for a Reformed Parliament.* London, 1868.
2. *Three English Statesmen.* By Goldwin Smith. London, 1868.
3. *Speech of Mr. Goldwin Smith at Brighton.* 'Daily News,' March 5th, 1868.
4. *England and Ireland.* By John Stuart Mill. London, 1868.
5. *Fortnightly Review.* 1865, 1866.

FROM these and other manifestoes of the Radicals who have recently risen into prominence, we propose to draw up an exposition of the opinions which are now avowed by the party. We need not dwell upon the importance of arriving at a proper understanding of those opinions, or of endeavouring to estimate their probable influence and tendency. There was a time when they possessed little more than an abstract and speculative interest. They were curious as supplying an illustration, more forcible than any argument, of the disposition with which theorists approached the task of refashioning a political system. While they were this only, the majority of men were disposed to turn from them with the indifferent feelings which they generally entertain towards fantastic and impracticable projects. We now stand in a different position. They form the creed of a party which is struggling to acquire a preponderating influence in the government of the country. We know what that party has accomplished, and we should be insensible to the most pressing political issues of the day if we failed to ascertain the ends which it is still pursuing. The stage for rest, if ever we arrive at it at all, is certainly not in sight yet. Radicalism constantly

stantly passes into new phases, but it is never a stationary force. The leaders who imagine that they control the principles of the party not only misconceive their own position, but also the nature of the cause in which they have embarked. They may pause to reflect; but the followers whom they have reared are governed only by an anxiety to press forward with restless steps.

The goal of the elder Radicals is the starting point of the younger. It would be as vain to construct an estimate of Radical opinions from the principles contended for by Mr. Cobden as to measure them by the standard of Liberal opinions in the eighteenth century. More than once, within a short period of his death, Mr. Cobden exhibited signs of dissatisfaction with the extravagance of his younger colleagues. Could he return to the fold now, he would find himself the Rip Van Winkle of the Radical party. A new generation has come forward, and a leader who has been dead little more than three years might experience some difficulty in accommodating his habit to their tastes. It used to be thought that there was no science more complex or more impenetrable than the science of government. Now we are wiser. Professors of the mystery are so plentiful that we cannot escape from the tumult of their invocations. The budding Radical discerns with one comprehensive glance all our errors in the past, and all our necessities in the future. Men no longer speak with uncertainty upon political problems. But uncertainty may be forgiven in the endeavour to form a harmonious design from the fluctuating ideas of Radical politicians. Scarcely is one object compassed before a new campaign is announced. The Reform Bill was to render us a happy and united people for years to come. We can understand, if we are unable to sympathise with, the dismay of the Ministers who have yielded so much when they find themselves subjected to fresh exactions. They complain that their treatment is very hard. It is in reality only the treatment which their own conduct has invited. Already, the Reform Bill has become an antiquated measure. Some Radical monitors assure us that household suffrage will not make any large additions to the voters, and that it will be well to complete our work before laying it aside. This question, however, they treat with the coolness of men who consider that there is no formidable impediment to its settlement. There are other details of their general plan upon which they are seeking to precipitate a contest. It is not permitted, it seems, for any one to suggest that the abolition of the Irish Church is a preliminary step to the overthrow of the English Church. On such points as these we are only allowed to argue in the enchanted circle which Radicals and their supporters mark

mark out. Other people, it is true, cannot help noticing that the party which is now bent on 'disestablishing' one Church has within it numerous members who have repeatedly declared their intention of applying the same process to the other. In a comprehensive discussion we have a right to consider the possible consequences of this combination, and to ask which section of the party is likely to prevail over the scruples or reasons of its associates? At present the entire brotherhood are busy in administering sedatives. The Irish Church, they tell us, is so unlike the English Church in all its relations, that no analogy can ever be drawn between them. It would be an unpardonable infatuation to place any confidence in these soothing professions. In these days of sudden conversions it would cost the Radical leaders no qualms to lay before us a wider programme, and to inform us that in dispersing the Irish Church we have acknowledged the mischief of endowments, and therefore ought not to keep up an endowed Church in England.

Upon these and all other subjects free inquiry is strenuously resisted by the Radical leaders. We must not discuss their opinions unless we intend to transfer our allegiance to them. If we think those opinions are open to some objections, we are at once proved to be foolish zealots in favour of an obsolete creed. If we condemn Radical projects, we are instantly called upon to meet a convulsive burst of indignation from that irregular troop which has appointed itself sole defender of the rights of the people, and which construes liberty of judgment to mean the suppression of all opinions adverse to its own. It is often asserted that in the United States freedom of discussion in a grave political crisis is carried on with great difficulty. In Congress the minority only speak by the favour of the majority, and outside a man utters an unpopular opinion at the risk of his position and reputation. We are engrafting so large a part of the American system upon our own form of government, that we need not be surprised to find this indispensable adjunct to it already established among us. The chiefs of the Radical party will not brook contradiction. This is one of the points of their policy which they are destined to be compelled to reverse. They have yet to learn that an assumption of superiority by individuals, and pretensions to a special right to leadership or power, will not be tolerated in a democratic community. In England we have a section of politicians who, if we judged from their own representations, would be entitled to the deference due to a celestial race which had descended to take part in human affairs. They talk and act as if they were

 gifted

gifted with a supernatural insight into the true principles of government. Even their own colleagues are denounced if they refuse to advance from one position to another day after day. These immoderate pretensions are short-lived in a democracy. A party may flourish and wield a modified despotism, but the leader falls the moment he betrays a consciousness that he is privileged to dictate to his associates. The confederacy which is popular for the moment will maintain the ascendency; but one man does not remain at the head of it for long together. Readers of Hawthorne's fanciful stories will remember the legend of the New England crone who turned a broomstick into a human being, and gave it the power to move and talk as long as it kept puffing smoke from a pipe. All went on well until one day the fire was allowed to go out, the smoke ceased, and the man collapsed into a scarecrow. The leaders of democracies hold life upon equally uncertain conditions. The breath of public favour which keeps the sustaining fire alive varies with every caprice, and ceases in a moment.

We conceive, then, that our privilege to discuss those who are at present called popular leaders is not less good than when we have to deal with inferior beings. It is sometimes said by these very leaders that the free interchange of thought between all classes of the community is one of the natural results of those 'reforms' which they have urged upon the country with so much force, and, we must add, with so much success. But unless the present indications are peculiar to the first stage of a struggle, and are destined to give way to a broader spirit when the victory is complete, the result is likely to belie these promises. When the Trades' Unions deputation recently held a parley with Mr. Gladstone, they were complimented by some friendly journals on the gracious manner in which they received the mild suggestions respectfully tendered for their consideration. It was thought much to their credit that when they left the house Mr. Gladstone was still alive and well. 'The working men,' remarked one writer, 'like frank and vigorous opposition.' These appreciative observers omitted to notice a report of a meeting held by the workmen afterwards, at which Mr. Gladstone's inoffensive advice provoked angry retorts. So, too, at a subsequent meeting a delegate protested against that rule of the Masons' Society which Mr. Gladstone had condemned as worthy of savages. Mr. Potter, whose claims to consideration must be known to all our readers, rebuked the delegate for this unseemly candour. 'But,' said the man, 'it is the truth.' The chairman made the unanswerable retort, 'that it was not always advisable

advisable to state the truth.'* This is precisely the spirit in which the popular leaders carry on a controversy from their side. With regard to their opponents, the convenient method is adopted of denying their right to speak, and contradicting their facts on Mr. Potter's favourite principle of 'not stating the truth.' But even at packed meetings, with closed doors, it is not always possible to prevent the truth creeping in at the windows. In the rooms of the Reform League, under the watchful eye of Mr. Beales himself, an American gentleman recently told a party of Radicals that so far from the American system of suffrage being pure, it led to frightful venality and corruption, and 'swamped' the most cultivated and intellectual portion of the community.† We need not say that this speech was garbled and reduced to a shadow in the Radical papers. That is their idea of free discussion. It is unreasonable to hear more than one side.

We have no pleasure in exaggerating the influence or importance of the popular leaders of our own day. It would be far more satisfactory to show that they are without power among us. But it is impossible to avoid perceiving that they have acquired a great control over the minds of the working classes. They are at the head of every fresh advance which is made. The recognised Liberal leaders of the House hold formal consultations with them, and they are kept well informed of the proceedings at the 'caucuses' which are now becoming an integral part of English party government. When that violent and mischievous crowd, which their leaders were pleased to call 'the people,' were told that they must not spout sedition in the parks, there soon ensued one of the most memorable and most shameful episodes in modern English history. The Government proclaimed that though it might be impenetrable to reason and argument, anything might be wrung from it by threats. All that was wanted to make it melt as wax was a mob and a man called a patriot at the head of it. It was not thus that an English Government could once be terrified from pursuing a course upon which it had decided, nor was it by the use of such methods of intimidation that the leaders of 1688, whose names are now borrowed to dignify ignoble schemes, accomplished their difficult purposes. In the French Revolution there was a Mirabeau, and there was also a 'Mirabeau of the *sans-culottes*.' To which of these do the agitators of to-day correspond? Which is it that now privately lectures the chiefs of one party, and scares the Ministers of another, and dictates a

* Report in the 'Daily News,' 7th March, 1868.
† See Morning Papers of March 23rd.

policy to both? What elements in the nation do the minor leaders really represent? We see them apparently actuated by a strange hatred of every detail of our present form of government. The love of country which blinds a man to national faults is a delusion and a weakness, but it is upon the whole less contemptible and less mischievous than the craving to blacken the name and character of one's country before the world. The 'party of progress' in these days is constantly ready to cast dirt at England, and to supply others with the subject of reproaches against her. If this were always strictly just there would be little to be said. But it is seldom or never just. When the Radical leaders tell the world that we are purposely oppressive to Ireland, that our rule is one of 'fear and force,' and that we give her English laws and government because we are more conceited of our laws and government than any other people, they lend themselves to calumnies which not only are undeserved, but betray ignorance. When another oracle insinuates that we practise 'rapine' in India, under the pretence of propagating Christianity,* he merely lends the sanction of an English name to a misrepresentation, much in vogue with that singular race known as the Irish Americans. So, too, it is an injustice to insinuate that our press, 'reflecting too faithfully the morality of the nation,' preaches 'doctrines which in their naked form could be avowed only in the cavern of a bandit, or on the deck of a buccaneer;'† and that the conscience of the nation has 'become seared by the long exercise of empire.'‡ Since these are the opinions of England which the Radicals entertain, we need not be surprised at their urging us on to remedies which would 'mend the parts by ruin of the whole.'

The general plan pursued by this school, in and out of Parliament, is that which has long been in favour with those to whom political leadership is a substitute for a trade. Nothing is easier than to exaggerate defects or magnify abuses in any civil polity, but when all this is done the work of reform does not end. The Radical leaders assert, in effect, that it does. When they have pulled down they have accomplished their grand object. We read their books, their pamphlets, their speeches, in the hope of finding revealed some clear and comprehensive line of policy, and the nearest approach to a connected scheme is that beatified commonwealth lately pictured to us by Mr. Mill, in which every man shall be entitled to help himself to that which belongs to his neighbour. Their energies are concentrated upon the work of

* Mr. Goldwin Smith's 'Three English Statesmen' (popular edition), p. 56.
† Ibid., p. 72. ‡ Ibid.

causing

causing a general derangement in the political and social institutions of the country. The class which has not largely or directly participated in the exercise of political power is taught to believe that there are many causes of oppression at work in the Government, and none which they could not readily remove. But they are not shown how a constitution wiser and better than the one which has fallen out of fashion may be constructed. The destructive forces are all that their guides and counsellors teach them to employ. When they offer practical suggestions, they are soon seen to be so irrational as to provoke the laughter of the civilised world. Mr. Mill, with his agrarianism, and Mr. Goldwin Smith with his dark hints of a national council, are what we are promised in exchange for a constitution which has been well described as the parent of all free constitutions throughout the world. 'But,' it is said, 'these are earnest men —these are men of deep convictions.' Even if this were true of all, it would clearly be no proof that they are so absolutely in the right as that all who differ with them must be absolutely in the wrong. Nor does it ensue that a man of 'deep convictions' will always have a sound judgment. His convictions may lead him to the conclusion that his neighbour's houses ought to be burnt down for the general good of the street, but if a contrary opinion should prevail on the part of the threatened persons, it would only be reasonable. The Radical party protest that they will do no harm—that all future events will happen exactly as they point out. In this respect, as in many others, they confound obliquity of judgment with the gift of prophetic foresight. They believe that their conclusions are sound, and that it is impossible for results to fall out in any other way than that which they deem natural and becoming. But the confidence of others may be shaken by observing that they do not agree among each other as to the disease or the remedy to be applied. Lord Russell offers us one specific, and Mr. Mill offers us another, and both threaten us with the pains of annihilation if we hesitate about taking either. Differences of this kind may possibly cause a permanent division in the Liberal party. There will be an extreme section and a moderate section, but if a parallel could be drawn from the kindred conflict which has been going on in the United States since the Civil War, the moderate party would have little to hope for. The timid Liberals, as they are called, may counsel prudence and restraint, but they must either keep pace with their more eager associates or submit to be cast off altogether. Some cries of distress from the men who have lingering compunctions concerning the course upon which the party is entering, already make themselves heard. One writer is candid enough to assure us that

that if vote by ballot had existed in Parliament, surrounded with 'inviolable secresy,' 'time after time Mr. Disraeli's household suffrage measure would have been thrown out by overwhelming majorities.'* Qualify this confession as the writer may, it combines with other circumstances to prove that there are members of the Liberal party who are not easy with regard to the work they have professed so much anxiety to accomplish. But their scruples are absurd. What is to become of them if they refuse to follow the lead of their chiefs? Form an independent party to be extinguished by a nickname? 'Let us do no more at present,' says the writer we have just quoted, in effect—'let us wait.' As well might he say at once, 'Let us go back.' The iron point of necessity will drive the waverers forward, and place them once more beneath the banner of freedom carried by Lord Amberley and Mr. Potter. The stress of party warfare, or the ascendency which prejudices fostered by popular applause rapidly gain, may even lead those who once were no enemies to the English constitution to turn round and defame it. It is a common mistake, after all that we have seen, to suppose that a man may go a certain distance with the work of agitation, and then turn back. The leader who tries to effect this movement is soon undeceived. The path closes up behind him. He advances or is trodden down.

When we cast our eyes over the list of leaders in the 'new crusade' we find some men whose proper place is clearly where they are, but there are others whose appearance may well awaken astonishment. We do not wonder that Mr. Fawcett is in that position, for he has argued that religious differences cause much trouble in families, that political differences could not create more, and therefore that married women ought to be allowed to vote. Moreover, he has complained that there are scores of men whose sympathies are with the people who cannot get returned to the House of Commons—as if that will not be true whatever happens. Mr. Fawcett, indeed, is one of those politicians whose opinions are in a fluid state. It is impossible to foretell into what channels they may run, or over how wide a surface they may spread. Probably Mr. Fawcett himself could not imagine a scheme which he would be unwilling to support if its advocacy would be certain to gratify what is called popular feeling. He has recently told the world that he would have Mormons represented in Parliament—and why? Because 'Mormonism had its noble and even glorious side,' and had 'exhibited socialism and communism in a practical and successful form.'

* 'St. Paul's Magazine' for March.

Since

Since Mr. Fawcett admires socialism and communism, he naturally desires to see those principles represented in Parliament. But he makes no inquiry whether the state of society in England could be assimilated to the state of society in Utah, or whether one institution of a particular system could be transported into a totally different system without producing general dislocation. Communism has been successful in Utah, therefore let us have communism represented in the English House of Commons. Before enlightened principles were less general than they are now, such a method of reasoning would have been likely to provoke derision. Moreover, communism across the Rocky Mountains is not restricted to land. Pray, how far would Mr. Fawcett have us go in our imitation of the manners and customs of the Mormons? There are public teachers who assure us that the principle of communism in domestic relations is productive of much happiness and content, and they might consistently argue, that if it be right to take a man's land, how can it be wrong to go a step further, and help yourself to anything you may covet in his house? It is unnecessary to attribute unworthy motives to Mr. Fawcett, but can it be doubted that some of his opinions are constructed upon models which he thinks will exactly suit the taste of the working man? We should be underrating his intelligence if we supposed that he would really like to see every principle he has contended for in recent years carried into effect in this country.

It is one of the grave faults of this section of the Radical party that they seldom stop to consider the consequences of their propositions, and that too often they bolster up their arguments by statements which they ought to know could never be substantiated. When, for example, universal suffrage is demanded on the ground that it prevents corruption at elections, it is difficult to respect the public man who uses the argument. Every properly informed person in the kingdom must have been aware that Mr. Baxter was misleading others, or was misled himself, when he said, two years ago, 'The extension of the suffrage would greatly diminish corruption. Large masses could not be bribed. There was nothing like bribery in American elections.' The assertion was utterly reckless and unfounded. Probably Mr. Baxter believed it. But a public man has no business to mistake his private beliefs for facts, and then insist that everybody else should be equally foolish. Ignorance of the facts is no excuse. It is the duty of a public teacher to inquire into facts before making statements. This confusion between opinions and the actual circumst
the world is even less tolerable than the predictions wh

shadow our future, such as those which Mr. Mill sometimes throws out for our guidance. 'When they came to universal suffrage,' he once said to the House of Commons, 'as it was probable some time they would do.' Universal suffrage and communism! Can we be surprised that Mr. Fawcett joyfully acknowledges Mr. Mill as a political leader? What if their opinions sound strange to English ears? 'Strangeness,' to hear Mr. Mill's own explanation, 'was a thing which wore off. Some things were strange to many of them three months ago which were not so now; and many others were strange now, which would not be so a few months hence.'* This is modern progress made lovely by the bright colours and dexterous brush of a master.

No one can fail to see that the recent acquisitions to the strength of the 'advanced' party have thrown it slightly off its balance. The leadership is divided, and each man who has a special vagary under his tutelage has seized a portion of the prize. Mr. Bright could formerly have encircled all his followers with one elastic ring, but now the Radical party cannot strictly be called his followers at all. His eloquence gives him a certain supremacy, but it is not a supremacy which could effect so much as at an earlier period of his life. He, too, has fallen upon evil days, and he does well probably to gird up his loins for office. His younger disciples are outstripping him. Age steadies men; but the young patriot, with the world spread fair before him, laughs at the hesitation of his seniors. Mr. Bright, in the course of his long public life, has not made many professions of faith which we have felt ourselves called upon to admire. But he is a man of very moderate aims compared with the later offshoots of the great Radical stem. If he has ever entertained an 'affinity' for the Mormons he has kept the foible a close secret. If communism suggests to his mind the most perfect form of government, he has never openly avowed his convictions. Mr. Fawcett is therefore in advance of Mr. Bright; and in so far as he is in advance he has greater claims to the leadership of the party. The subalterns require men who will conduct them to victory; and there are few victories to be gained in the fields already fought over. Their patriotism, in some cases—we do not say in all—resembles that tender feeling which Macaulay attributes to the first Pitt. 'He was not invited to become a placeman, and he therefore stuck firmly to his old trade of patriot.' It is very well for one leader to have arrived in sight of the promised land, but what is to support the followers? When the old bird has grown tired of carrying food to

* Debate in House of Commons, May 20, 1867.

the

the young ones, they usually turn out into the world to forage for themselves. We may be very sure that the younger Radicals will not perish in the wilderness. They must have leaders who understand the 'spirit of the age.' And there is a varied choice before them.

In Mr. Forster, of Bradford, they have a man with whom, as he has told us himself, 'Radicalism dates back to the training of his childhood.' It would be unreasonable to ask for a testimonial to character which dated back further than that. In a more ponderous, laboured, and bombastic form, the younger Radicals are courted by one who has been heralded as a born statesman, but who has done little as yet for his party, and much less for the country. If breaking down in his first commission be a proof of genius, we must own that the pretensions of Mr. Göschen are fully sustained. But he will never be a successful leader of the 'progressive Liberals,' for there always seems to be a painful uncertainty in his mind concerning the length to which it is safe to go. His opinions work their way tediously through many strata of doubt, and Mr. Göschen never seems to be quite satisfied with their appearance when he presents them, with much circumlocution, to the world. A true Radical leader must never hesitate, and never doubt. There are such men now pressing forward to the front. We have already said that Mr. Fawcett's right to be there is indisputable. Even he, however, is not so good a Radical as some of those who are at this moment dependent on the Speaker's favour for admission to the House, but who are gradually making good their right of entrance. The theory that Members of Parliament should be nothing more than deputies, paid as other servants, and with no more right to disobey their masters than ordinary domestics have, is now professed by more than one aspiring candidate. The truth is, that the competition is so sharp and general, that the leader of to-day can never be sure that he will not be outbid to-morrow. Will Mr. Fawcett survive a contest with Mr. Potter? Has not Mr. Bright visibly declined in influence over his apt pupils? The only plan by which the support of the Radical party can be gained is to obey its behests without shrinking back. Mr. Gladstone is far too sagacious as a party leader not to be fully conscious of this fact. The moment he opposes his own views to those of his promiscuous followers he becomes absolutely powerless. They go on without him till he overcomes his scruples, till he is able to announce that 'the hour has come when the call of duty summons,' till the process of gestation is accomplish- Then he is once more placed at the head of the Liberal p with the applause of all its members. But the distincti

es

earned, not conferred. If Mr. Gladstone had retained his former opinions concerning the Irish Church, where would he be to-day? The followers in this case have educated the leader, and it would be idle to prescribe a limit to their enterprise or skill. To lead the Radical party a man must hold all opinions dear to the Radicals, and hold them with tact. In other words, he must be prepared to let fall some which may be deemed unsuitable, and to pick up others which are growing into favour.

A politician who was a Radical in his cradle, and had the slumbers of his childhood refreshed by sweet dreams of universal suffrage, is likely to comply with these conditions. We should predict, therefore, a brilliant career for Mr. Forster. We may be sure that the Church and other trifles will not stand in his way. For the same reason we do not object to Lord Amberley's place in the vanguard of liberty. He has been applying his faculties to the analysis of the Tory mind, and attacking with flippant pertness a Church which is the object of affection, veneration, and comfort to thousands of our countrymen in every part of the world, and to which even those who stand outside it do not deny the tribute of respect. But no one could have anticipated that Mr. John Stuart Mill would have made a formal alliance with a party which avows that in our political and social system there is nothing which is not worthless, nothing which ought not to be discarded. In these times it is not much to say that a man reviles the opinions which he once professed, and has adapted himself to a new mental outfit. But there are special circumstances which would have justified us in looking for something approaching to fixity of purpose in Mr. Mill. He has written as if he were in earnest, and his earnestness has swayed the minds of other men. He is a philosopher—we use the word in no jeering sense—and philosophers are not supposed to care much about the fashion of their opinions. He has founded a distinct school of thought. We have, in common with others, derived so much instruction from his earlier writings, that we view with pain and sorrow the aberrations of a powerful intellect. 'There is an uncertainty,' he has told us, 'about half-informed people. You cannot tell what their way of thinking may be. It varies from day to day, perhaps with the last book they have read.'* With this assumption of superiority to human infirmities we have a right to expect calm and well-considered opinions, and consistency in maintaining them, even if we put aside fixity of principle as unattainable.

Mr. Mill has advocated liberty, but in the works which made

* Speech in House of Commons, May 31, 1866.

his

his reputation he was never the apostle of anarchy and confiscation. He has pleaded for many opinions which we should deem crotchety or unsound, but, as we shall presently show, his air-drawn phantasies were always leavened with the qualifying ingredient of sober sense. In the rash projects of his riper years we might be content to let Mr. Mill be a reproof unto himself. We might appeal from Mr. Mill the politician to Mr. Mill the philosopher. Since he has taken an active part in politics he has discovered that the end of the science of government is to surrender to a discontented section of the population all that they demand, without reference to considerations of justice, expediency, or existing interests. If any number of malcontents insist that the land which belongs to private persons shall be made over to them, the other section must submit to the injury. It may be an injury of the most grievous and aggravated form to compel a man to part with his property at a price set upon it by another. Mr. Mill treats all such considerations with lofty contempt. We have not to ask whether this kingdom upon the whole is governed fairly and with good intentions, but whether a dissatisfied class, no matter what that class may be at the moment, desire to modify the plan of the government. If they crave for a government suggested by the inconstant and reckless whims of *doctrinaires*, they ought to have it. This is the plain teaching of Mr. Mill's pamphlet upon Ireland, and it amounts, when stripped of fine phrases, to an idea of government which would be rejected by a confederation of brigands. If one loses or squanders his share he is to make it up by impoverishing the common stock. Even freebooters could not keep up a band on such a system. 'What signifies it,' asks Mr. Mill, 'that the law is the same in England and Ireland, if opinion and the social circumstances of the country are better than the law?'* This is a pregnant question. Opinion, then, is above law. The only test of the propriety or justice of a law is the opinion of those who, from various causes, are dissatisfied with it. If we hesitate to adopt this new method of holding a commonwealth together we are pronounced to be a nation 'basking in a fool's paradise,' conceited above all other nations of our institutions, a people incapable of understanding. If any one suggests the use of those means for maintaining the integrity of the empire which we find in daily requisition elsewhere—in Mr. Mill's model republic as well as in this besotted land—Mr. Mill replies to him thus:—'The time is come when the democracy of one country will join hands with the democracy

* 'England and Ireland,' p. 13.

of

of another, rather than back their own ruling authorities in putting it down.' *

These expressions are casual illustrations of the imperious dogmatism which the Radical school have adopted as the vehicle of their opinions. It is not a suggestion which they present to us, it is an ordinance. Mr. Mill has eloquently advocated, on abstract principles, the right of liberty of opinion, and he has thereby gained a lasting fame. But the proverbial discordance between precept and example is verified afresh in his case. His own habitual method of argument supplies the most striking instance that could well be found in the whole range of controversy of absolute intolerance. He does not permit himself to exchange reasons with his opponents—it is a quicker process to knock them down. They are incapable, dull-witted, stupid, conceited, insensible to truth. And yet Mr. Mill has himself instructed us that the worst offence we can commit against liberty 'is to stigmatise those who hold the contrary opinion as bad and immoral men,' † which is an exact and concise description of what Mr. Mill does whenever he addresses this perverse generation. When he heaps objurgations on the heads of those who object to an unrestricted suffrage, or to the dominance of the uneducated class, or to confiscation, he ought to remember that the offenders may have been brought up at his own feet. The doctrines which he now denounces with so much passion may formerly have been his own. It is hard when a man forgets his own children, and not only turns them out of doors, but takes away their character. Mr. Mill once taught that extreme prejudices to the disadvantage of the rich formed 'a probable result of democratic feeling.' If socialist opinions were added to these prejudices—and the opinions advanced in the pamphlet on Ireland have a direct tendency towards socialism, so far as they have any practical bearing at all—then, he says, 'it may become infamous in the eyes of the majority to possess more property than some very small amount, or any income not earned by manual labour.' ‡ This is all that those who wished to make cautious changes, instead of violent revolutions, in our Constitution ever ventured to maintain; and behold! Mr. Mill sallied forth upon them with thick bludgeons, and scattered them with grievous blows. He was ashamed to think that such poor spiritless creatures could be his own countrymen. He proved that any party putting forward these views must by an irreversible law be the 'stupidest' party. In that case, we should have thought, we might have been spared his denunciations.

* 'England and Ireland,' p. 26. † 'Essay on Liberty' (Popular edition), p. 31.
‡ Ibid., p. 52.

Men

Men are not expected to fight against the destinies. But formerly he gave a practical application to his general reflection which few others have dared to suggest: 'Opinions similar in principle to these already prevail widely among the artisan class, and weigh oppressively on those who are amenable to the opinion chiefly of that class, namely, its own members' ('Liberty,' page 52). If this remark be true at all, it must be true no matter who makes it. But in practice we do not find that is so. 'What is one man's meat,' says the homely proverb, 'is another man's poison.' In Mr. Mill's mouth the observations we have quoted are wisdom; in the mouths of others they are pure fatuity, insolent calumny, we know not what. If any man who is opposed to a democratic rule of the majority should justify himself upon the ground that property might be placed in jeopardy, he ought rather to be accused by Mr. Mill of imitation, the sincerest form of flattery, than of ignorance and blindness. For Mr. Mill has written, 'Is there not a considerable danger lest they [the majority] should throw upon the possessors of what is called realised property, and upon the larger incomes, an unfair share, or even the whole, of the burden of taxation, and having done so, add to the amount without scruple, expending the proceeds in modes supposed to conduce to the profit and advantage of the labouring class?'* What fairness is there in a man who could put this question to us as a serious study, turning round and denouncing those who cannot answer it satisfactorily?

Again, he says, 'We know what powerful arguments, the more dangerous because there is a portion of truth in them, may be brought against all inheritance, against the power of bequest, against every advantage which one person seems to have over another' (page 51). He goes on to ask—'Is it reasonable to think that even much more cultivated minds than those of the numerical majority can be expected to be, will have so delicate a conscience, and so just an appreciation of what is against their own apparent interest, that they will reject these and the innumerable other fallacies which will press in upon them from all quarters, as soon as they come into power, to induce them to follow their own selfish inclinations and short-sighted notions of their own good, in opposition to justice, at the expense of all other classes and of posterity?' (Ibid.). Now these are not questions which turn upon the shifting politics of the hour. They involve a principle which could not have been true in 1865 and false in 1868. They go to the very root of all the vices of a political system. Yet if an attempt be

* 'Representative Government,' Popular edition, 1865, pp. 48, 49.

made

made to apply the truth, a truth which Mr. Mill has solemnly enjoined upon us in practical legislation, no language is too violent to condemn the proceeding. It is good enough for a treatise, but it is not good enough for the demagogue's corner of the House of Commons. A philosopher who changes his doctrine with every change of the moon may be called eccentric, but the philosopher who swallows his own tenets as coolly as some animals swallow their young, and frowns on those whom he taught to respect his words, gives his truest admirers much cause for sorrow and regret.

During the discussions of recent years upon Reform, it was often contended by Lord Cranborne and others that a rule of numbers might probably fall under the control of interests which were adverse to the interests of the country at large. We must all remember with what indignation these suggestions were received by Mr. Mill and his friends. Can we, then, find the sanction of no high authority for them? We turn to Mr. Mill's 'Representative Government,' and there we see it written:—

'Looking at democracy in the way in which it is commonly conceived, as the rule of the numerical majority, it is surely possible that the ruling power may be under the dominion of sectional or class interests, pointing to conduct different from that which would be dictated by impartial regard for the interest of all. . . . . Suppose, again, a minority of skilled labourers, a majority of unskilled: the experience of many Trade Unions, unless they are greatly calumniated, justifies the apprehension that equality of earnings might be imposed as an obligation, and that piecework, payment by the hour, and all practices which enable superior industry or ability to gain a superior reward, might be put down. Legislative attempts to raise wages, limitation of competition in the labour market, taxes or restrictions on machinery, and on improvements of all kinds tending to dispense with any of the existing labour—even, perhaps, protection of the home producer against foreign industry—are very natural (I do not venture to say whether probable) results of a feeling of class interest in a governing majority of manual labourers' (pp. 48, 49).

These, again, are not opinions which were hastily expressed, or which any circumstances have disproved. They are the result of serious study and thought, and of a wise estimate of all the conditions of true statesmanship. Why Mr. Mill has discarded them is a matter which he may be left to settle with himself. But until he has exposed their fallacy, how can he require his earnest followers to forget all the training they have received from him? The exigencies of political life are great; but Mr. Mill's voice has reached many thousands who know little more of political life than what he has taught them. They cannot change the

the whole structure of their minds so soon as their master. We maintain that Mr. Mill should at least have patience with his own disciples. If he begins teaching afresh, he must give them time to understand his new dogmas. We may easily forgive the man who has misled us; but he ought never to reproach us for the consequences of the mistake. Mr. Mill now bids us prepare for universal suffrage. In the days when he allowed his reason to guide him to conclusions he never recommended an unlimited franchise; and in advocating extensions he was careful to insist on the importance of various safeguards against the dominion of mere numbers. Plural voting was one of these expedients; 'for,' said Mr. Mill, 'it is not useful, but hurtful, that the constitution of the country should declare ignorance to be entitled to as much political power as knowledge.' ('Representative Government,' p. 73.) That all men should be accounted equal in the exercise of political power is a dogma we have held to be false and mischievous. Might we not have learnt that lesson also from Mr. Mill? Let us hear him:—

'The American institutions have imprinted strongly on the American mind, that any one man (with a white skin) is as good as any other; and it is felt that *this false creed* is nearly connected with some of the more unfavourable points in American character. *It is not a small mischief that the constitution of any country should sanction this creed;* for the belief in it, whether express or tacit, is almost as detrimental to moral and intellectual excellence, as any effect which most forms of government can produce.'—'Representative Government' (popular edition), p. 74.

He proceeds to show that when once the 'less educated classes' are made the possessors of power they know that their mere will can prevail, and reason has little influence over them. If it were a politician fishing for votes who had enunciated these principles, and afterwards repudiated them all, we could understand his motives, and we should see the uselessness of appealing to his regard for his own consistency. When a public man now is caught in the act of eating his own words, his offence is wiped away if he pleads, 'No matter what I professed yesterday—*this* is what I say now.' But we cannot consent to have Mr. Mill degraded to this level. He is a man of whom his country is proud, and that he should be the first to undo the labours of a lifetime, and to declare all his political teachings fallacious, is nothing less than a national misfortune.

If we invite the reader to glance at two or three other passages from Mr. Mill's writings, it is not so much for the purpose of proving that Mr. Mill has changed his opinions, as to vindicate those who still think that there is weight and force in them:—

'The

'The natural tendency of representative government, as of modern civilisation, is towards collective mediocrity: and this tendency is increased by all reductions and extensions of the franchise, their effect being to place the principal power in the hands of classes more and more below the highest level of instruction in the community. . . . . It is an admitted fact that in the American democracy, which is constructed on this faulty model [*i.e.* of representation according to local majorities], the highly cultivated members of the community, except such of them as are willing to sacrifice their own opinions and modes of judgment, and become the servile mouthpieces of their inferiors in knowledge, seldom even offer themselves for Congress or the State Legislatures, so little likelihood have they of being returned.'—'Representative Government,' p. 59.

'Those, indeed, if any such there be, who under pretence of equal justice, aim only at substituting the class ascendancy of the poor for that of the rich, will of course be unfavourable to a scheme which places both on a level. [The 'scheme' referred to is Mr. Hare's plan of representation.] But I do not believe that any such wish exists at present among the working classes of the country, *though I would not answer for the effect which opportunity and demagogic artifices may hereafter have in exciting it.*'—Ibid., p. 61.

Upon this latter remark Mr. Mill might found pretensions as a seer, and they would be more generally conceded than his recent claims to our reverence as a sage. He is now teaching that everything in government must be yielded to clamour, and he summons the forces of obloquy and popular resentment for the suppression of contrary opinions. We cannot wonder that the school has already produced a luminary, who strongly recommends Catiline to our approval as a party leader, and thinks Tiberius was a model ruler.

But the gall which Mr. Mill drops into the cup of wisdom offered to his disciples is grateful and pleasant compared with the venom which inferior men force to our lips. It is possible to respect the author of the treatises on 'Logic' and 'Political Economy,' but we can only stand in awe of Mr. Goldwin Smith. He is less a philosopher than a scourge. He issues his dread decrees, and his path is strewn with the bones of the disobedient. We have some diffidence in suggesting that he follows any leader. He has erected for himself a solitary throne, and we hear his voice from it occasionally, sending forth commands, much as sea captains of the old school used to issue theirs, with a rich exuberance of bad language. Other Radicals remember that discretion is no less necessary than courage for the success of a campaign. They do not make us acquainted with all their hopes in one proclamation. But Mr. Goldwin Smith cannot constrain himself, probably from constitutional causes.

causes. He cannot even breathe unseen. Naturalists tell us that the curious little creature known as the water eft, not being blessed with gills, is constantly under the necessity of rising to the surface to take in fresh air. And so is it with Mr. Goldwin Smith. It is impossible for him to keep out of sight. There is some defect in his composition which obliges him to be always on the surface, and it would be flattery to say that the air is improved by his visits. He is one of those men, very inconvenient to the party which owns him, but very useful to the general public, who loudly express what is only the secret thoughts of their associates, or even propose plans from which they would shrink. When Mr. Mill is betrayed into excesses, we may remember that he has made contributions to our literature which entitle him to our admiration. But what is Mr. Goldwin Smith's claim upon our fealty? What has he done that he should dictate to all England? When we review what he would abolish, we shall find that it includes almost all that we at present possess. We survey the field after he has passed over it, and discover that he has swept it bare. The monarchy has received its doom at his hands. The House of Lords shares the same fate. The minor institutions of the Church and the law of primogeniture follow in their train. 'It was impossible for any one,' he said at Brighton, 'who looked around, to avoid the conviction that the roots of hereditary monarchy were dead.' This passage having apparently provoked some comment, Mr. Goldwin Smith wrote what is called a 'characteristic' letter, with the object of showing that his remarks applied to Europe, and, by implication, not to England. It is dangerous, in describing Mr. Goldwin Smith's statements, to do anything but quote his own words, and we therefore ask the attention of the reader to the following extract:—

'The idea of the right of a family to govern a nation, and the poetic though irrational and primitive feeling in behalf of a particular family, was gone, and could not revive.'

After referring to other European dynasties, he went on to say:—

'*Even in our own country* the feeling of veneration for the monarchy had passed away, and the affection entertained for her present Majesty was purely personal, and arose in no degree from a feeling in favour of the dynasty, or a veneration for monarchy as a great conservative institution. That was abundantly proved some time ago, when her Majesty, under the pressure of a great affliction, the indulgence of which nobody ought to have disturbed, withdrew from public life. Many of her subjects expressed sentiments, as time went on, far from loyal. . . . . That showed that the old feeling towards the monarchy had

had grown very weak, and that, as a political institution apart from its social position, it stood upon a very weak foundation.'

He then discussed the question Whether we should have an elective monarchy? That result he thought very improbable. 'He was himself inclined to believe that the tendency of nations was to be governed more and more by national councils.' Now is there any possibility of misunderstanding this language? Mr. Goldwin Smith is probably in advance of some of his friends, but he is very useful as a finger-post. He denotes the road on which we are travelling. 'The hereditary House of Lords,' he continues, 'in this country was like the last leaf on the bough, and, although it hung with great tenacity, it was not likely to hang very much longer.' Then of the Church: 'The religious world presented the aspect of a great and almost fearful crisis, in the face of which it did not seem to him that Church Establishments could last very long.'

When Mr. Goldwin Smith lays down these axioms of government, it is not for the purpose of inviting a fair discussion of their reasonableness or expedience. They are sent forth as rescripts which it would be fatal to disobey. He constantly gives us the most solemn warnings against hesitating to follow him. He lets us know that it would be like flying in the face of Providence. Before finally crushing the unbelievers, he overwhelms them with multitudinous little sneers. Lord Stanley has not adopted Mr. Goldwin Smith's views concerning Ireland (whatever they may be), and for this contumacy he is subjected to Mr. Smith's severest disdain. 'Lord Stanley,' he wrote to his usual organ,* 'pronounces that England and Ireland are inseparable now and for ever. If this is his Lordship's fiat, no doubt Nature will obey.' Can any satire be keener? Lord Stanley is also called with fine irony a 'person of quality,' and it is insinuated that he has a 'narrow superciliousness which is one of the surest marks of want of genius.' Imagine Mr. Goldwin Smith accusing any one of superciliousness! It is possible that his writings, fevered and disordered as they are, would exercise a more decided influence but for the excessive acrimony which he infuses into them. Whenever he speaks of England it is with the sour and snappish sarcasms of an angry scold. He has even announced his intention of turning his back upon an unthankful country, although his friends console us in an amusing aside by assuring us that he does not mean it. 'I am going!' cries the principal actor; 'but not if you elect him to Parliament' whisper his friends to the audience. The little play

* 'Daily News,' 24th February.

reminds

reminds one of the wandering trader in a rural fair, whose threatened departure is only to be checked by the crowd buying up all his brass chains. This peculiar clanship of the Radicals is constantly of the utmost service to them. They take it in turns to help each other. If one man bids a loud adieu to his native land, the others stand by to tell us his price for remaining. If one is attacked by a profane critic, the rest spring out and pelt him with epithets, of which 'insolent' and 'impertinent' are the gentlest examples. It must be understood, indeed, that it is always an impertinence to say 'No' to a Radical's 'Yes.' We must, therefore, under dire penalties, join with Mr. Goldwin Smith in asserting that we live in the worst country on the face of the earth. 'England,' he says with withering sarcasm, 'is the favourite of heaven, and when she commits oppression it will not recoil on the oppressor.'* When the 'recoil' comes and desolation overtakes us, there is one, at least, among us who will raise his voice in a song of thanksgiving and triumph from amid the wreck.

But Mr. Goldwin Smith would not have us understand that he wishes to see a revolution. At least he would not call it by that name. His favourite method of teaching upon this question is by innuendo. 'Let us,' he says, 'never glorify revolution'—'yet,' he adds, 'revolutions send capacity to the front with volcanic force across all the obstacles of envy and of class.' Which, then, would we rather have—capacity to the front or no revolution? Surely an intelligent man ought not to hesitate in such a choice. And again: 'The thought returns that . . . the race which produced Cromwell may at its need produce his peer, and that the spirit of the great usurper may once more stand forth in arms' ('Three Statesmen,' p. 26). 'We will hope,' he says in another part of the same instructive work, 'that in the course of our political changes, we shall find a way of establishing a Government to which we may all feel loyal, and which we may all desire to support as the Government not of a party but the nation.' He does not give us any positive ideas as to the composition of this Government, but his readers must be very dull if they cannot suggest one of its heads. Here is another example of Mr. Smith's sentiments: 'The fear that Europe will soon be either Republican or Cossack does not seem to me chimerical; *the fear that it will be Cossack does*' ('Three Statesmen,' p. 75). Here the oracle utters a veiled saying, but when he speaks of a standing army he is plain enough. It is propagandist, and 'it has infected the governing class with a tendency to violence and

* 'Three English Statesmen,' p. 63.

martial law' (p. 79). So in referring to the case of Whollagan, who shot a boy during the rebellion in Ireland of 1798, and was acquitted by the Court, he says of the Judges who tried him: 'Their sentiments seem, in fact, to have been pretty much the same as those which prevail in high official regions now' ('Essay on Pitt'). Elsewhere he talks of the 'aristocratic recklessness of plebeian blood.' Take one other gem of thought: 'A class Parliament is an oligarchy with a broad basis, more powerful for iniquity than any Crown.'

Now it is to be observed that these regenerators of society do not propose to abolish class Parliaments. They assert that we have been governed by one class, and they aim to substitute another class for it. No one who properly examines the question can doubt that this is the result which their reforms tend to produce. If it were a wiser mingling of all classes which they desired to bring about, the bitterness of their attacks on any one class would be impolitic as well as superfluous. It would be possible, moreover, to discuss with entire candour on both sides the qualifications which recommend the incoming class to supremacy in the Government. We know that there are Liberals who would have been better satisfied with the prospect before us, if education had preceded the suffrage. We can at present only judge of the fitness of the labouring classes for government by the use they have made of the powers of government in the past. They have long exercised those powers on a scale which, though limited, is ample to give us an idea of the spirit which guides them. We have a right to consider what they have done in their own province, especially when we find it said of Trades' Unions by a Liberal writer that 'they indicate such an appreciation of the value of true government as is found in no other class' ('Essays on Reform,' p. 36). Now what is this appreciation of government? If the government of England could be made to correspond with the government of Trades' Unions in intention and spirit, what would it be like? We will not dwell upon the patent fact that the primary object of these Societies is to carry out a sentiment of equality at the cost of their more intelligent and skilful members, by placing a good workman upon a level with the bad. This is an injustice which capital could not perpetrate without sacrificing its own interests. But is it possible, we may ask, that any fair man can shut his eyes to the dominant idea which runs through the whole system of Trades' Unionism? Is it not to compel men to obey the orders of a central organisation, without discussion or deliberation, and to punish recalcitrants by depriving them of their bread or their life? If a man belongs to a Trades' Union he must take so much money for

for his work and no more, he must work so many hours a day and no more, and he must only accept work from employers who take Union men—from 'Union-houses,' as they are called. We have no doubt that Mr. Potter would deny all this; but then he has distinctly given us to understand that the truth must not be told. Suppose the working man objects to the rules of his Society, or any part of them? Suppose he withdraws from the Society? Instantly a wide-reaching piece of machinery is set in motion to destroy him. He may leave one town and wander to another, but wherever he goes he is an outcast. The best shops are closed to him, or if under great stress a master employs him, his fellow-workmen cut him off from all communication with them. In its effects there is no more savage form of tyranny conceivable than this, as many a working man could testify. *We* may be deceived by such representations as that of the writer we have quoted above; the working classes are not. But if they go to public meetings they are silenced by the Potters who have no reason to be anxious to have the plain truth come out. We do not seek to exaggerate such crimes as those recently exposed at Sheffield, for we prefer to believe that they are exceptional. But the whole system is one of coercion and oppression, the provident fund alone excepted. Let a strike be decreed, and a man who is perfectly satisfied with his employers, and has no reason to complain, must leave his work and plunge his family into want. It may be that the worst men in the trade have caused the strike. The best men have no alternative but to join in it. Is this the kind of principle upon which we should be anxious to build up a new Government for ourselves?

This aspect of Trades' Unionism is never alluded to by the Radical chiefs, and we need not look for greater honesty in the subalterns. As we descend in the scale, indeed, we naturally expect to find the theories of the party grow more and more repulsive, we will not say to fastidious minds, but to common sense. The leaders cannot always divest themselves of a certain sense of responsibility. It rarely encumbers them, as we may plainly see, but sometimes it leads them to make only a partial revelation of their aims. We go to the rank and file to discover the true tone of the party. If they give the note coarsely, the ring is at least genuine. There we are shown without much affectation of modesty that source of patriotism which people usually leave decently in the background. It is not confined to the Radicals, but we have always understood that they are nobler and purer than others. If they are not entirely free from the taint, they are, after all, no better than the wicked. We refer, of course, to the lust of power. The hope is that the day is coming when every

every man, except a Tory, shall receive what seemeth to him good. As for the Tory, emptiness and gnashing of teeth shall be his portion. We know that the greatest of men have been infected by the passion for power and place. How can we expect inspired lords and professors hungry for employment to resist the temptation? Their pressing grievance is that fortune has not hitherto rained her favours over a sufficiently wide surface. They would have, not a lottery, but a general scramble. In Mr. Goldwin Smith's 'Essay on Pitt,' he refers to those 'who monopolise power and patronage,' and of course find it 'practically excellent.' One of his friends speaks out more plainly: 'So completely are all the good things available monopolised by the governing class, that all other sections of the community are thereby greatly damnified and insultingly ignored.'* 'It is not only injurious,' continues this writer, with an honesty which we look for in vain from most of his party, 'but humiliating in the extreme to feel permanently shut out from a fair share of the good things of this world.' Here, then, we learn the prime defect of our government. 'Little Dick,' the pet of the village, 'may have the elements of genius and piety of the highest order, and yet it is absolutely impossible that Little Dick should ever become an archbishop.' Was there ever such an outrage committed on a free people? That is the light in which the working men are told to look at the question of representation. They cannot hold office themselves, or provide for their children, because a controlling influence in the suffrage has not been awarded to them. Let them get votes, and their sons (provided they have the elements of piety) may carry the spiritual crosier instead of the carnal one. They may also take their refreshing potations in a saloon instead of a tavern. Such, at least, is the obvious inference to be drawn from the picture given us by the writer just quoted of 'John Ploughman,' brooding 'over his mug of bad beer in the disreputable den *provided for him by a Parliament* in which he is not represented.' We may smile at such representations and arguments, but the classes to whom they are addressed do not smile at them. They think them over very seriously, and deem them to be unanswerable. More and more of recent years have they been taught to believe that the Government is responsible for an excess of supply over demand in the labour market —for bad harvests—for a declining trade—for vicissitudes in commerce—for high prices—for low wages. If the working man drinks bad beer, it is all through 'Parliament,' which alone stops

* 'Fortnightly Review,' April, 1866.

the

the universal flow of wine. There would be little occasion for surprise if the teachers of these doctrines succeeded in stirring up the classes whom they have filled with discontent to measures which might, according to Mr. Goldwin Smith's doctrine, 'send capacity to the front.' Dark menaces of such a consummation are sometimes thrown out. A journal of the party, irritated by the failure of the recent attempts to revive the prosecution of Mr. Eyre, said that his rule was 'stained by atrocities such as have not been equalled since the days of the first French revolution.' And there presently followed this significant passage:—

'Well will it be for the rich, the titled, and the refined, in the coming times, if that contempt for law which they approve in Jamaica, that hearty distrust of law which they have exhibited in England, is not imitated too well by the many, into whose hands power is more and more gravitating.'—'Daily News,' February 28th.

We are far from asserting that such desires or aims are now entertained by the working classes. We hold it to be fairly questionable whether their own minds would be brought to these mischievous conclusions if they were allowed to form an unprejudiced judgment on public affairs—if they read and thought for themselves instead of accepting as indisputable the representations of headstrong partisans. But any class which has little leisure to exhaust inquiry for itself is much in the hands of quick-witted men who come to it with the all-prevailing plea that they have solely its profit and advancement at heart. It is difficult for the poor to shut their doors on benefactors who appear before them, saying, 'All that you need to mitigate, or even totally remove, the hardships of your position, is the possession of political power. To that power you are properly entitled, and you have been wrongfully deprived of it by the artifices of unscrupulous and designing men, who have also contrived, by wicked laws, to divide the land of this kingdom among them. There is no reason why that land should not belong to you. What you want is power, and if you will support us we will pay you back by helping you to obtain that power.' Few men could venture at present to make their appeal to the multitude in these express words; but is not this the drift of the lessons which certain Radical teachers lay before the people? Have we not correctly indicated the impression which is produced on the minds of the poorer population by extreme speeches? The great Radical leaders cannot tell where the stone which they have set rolling down the hill will stop. They may cry '*festina lente!*' to their more impetuous followers, but they might as well attempt to change the course of the wind by waving a fan. The multitude which has

has believed the promise will exact its fulfilment. The Radical party are always extolling the intelligence of the working men, and yet they appear to believe that at a critical moment they will be able to manage them like docile children. They might be undeceived by the incidents which almost invariably happen at their public meetings, and by the character of the preliminary addresses of aspiring politicians who are feeling their way to Parliament. The spirit of intolerance has passed with too great a facility from the leaders to the multitude. Many meetings of working men have lately been held, and 'resolutions,' with the proper mark upon them, have been passed with unanimous consent. But this wonderful harmony of feeling is obtained by forcibly keeping down objectors. It is almost unsafe for a speaker on the opposition side to present himself before the audience.

In the newspapers of the 1st of April there was an account of a meeting of workmen, held under the direction of the excellent Mr. Potter, to take into consideration the proposed abolition of the Irish Church. Again the idea of liberty which prevails among the 'less educated class' found a striking illustration. The 'working men of London' were asked to hear a speaker who wished to put before them the arguments for the maintenance of the Irish Church. But freedom forbade the idea. The hapless speaker was assailed, as the Radical journals inform us, by 'loud groans and catcalls,' and scarcely a word that he said could be heard. If he had been allowed to express his opinions, the champions of liberty in the press would have carefully expunged his heresies from their well-winnowed reports. The authorised Radical creed may, however, be promulgated wherever the great Radical soothsayers choose to carry it. In the debate upon the 'Royal Parks Bill,' Mr. Mill observed that 'for centuries it had been the pride of this country that a man had a right to speak his mind on politics or other subjects *wherever he pleased.*' Under a Radical rule, that privilege is among our ancient possessions which are destined to be reformed away. A man must not speak his mind, unless it be a Radical mind. Any argument he may think proper to employ, even the most unscrupulous, is lawful if it bear the imprimatur of Messrs. Beales and Potter. No argument is admissible if his convictions take a different turn. Then he is insincere, unprincipled, brutalised, and depraved. That it is possible for any man *not* to be a Radical is to a Radical simply inconceivable. And this is the best excuse of the party for the narrowness, the bigotry, and the oppression which are essentially characteristic of its policy. The ambitious members, by a just retribution, endure part of the penalty of the evil they have wrought. The man who aims at popularity

popularity presents a body of electors with a clean sheet of paper, and vows that whatever is written upon it shall be binding on him for ever. It was always so with a special kind of candidate; but never was there so much written on the paper before. The favourite plan is to promise anything and everything. No man can be sure how much will be asked of him; but after he has taken the great pledges he is not likely to reject the small. It would be foolish to strain at the gnat after swallowing the camel.

We do not seek to throw upon the Radical party the sole responsibility of what must appear to many minds to be a great debasement of our public life. In some degree it is due to the universal distrust engendered by the duplicity or supineness of political leaders who are not nominally Radicals. The landmarks of the two great historic parties have been temporarily removed, and in the general confusion strange guides and counsellors offer themselves. Whatever may be the decision of the nation upon the claims they advance, it is certain that there is one contingency which has not entered into their calculations, and which must prove adverse to them. It is that the position which they are contending for in the name of the working classes may be demanded by the working classes for themselves. The Radical leaders have industriously taught the doctrine that the rewards of office have been engrossed by one section of the community to the wrong and disadvantage of the poor. That seed will come to fruit in any climate. The younger followers of Mr. Bright—or of Mr. Beales, which is it?—give advice with the assurance of men who never consider that the persons to whom they address themselves may possibly have decided opinions and plans of their own. They seem to think that the monopoly of power which they arrogate will be conceded to them by the newly enfranchised multitudes whom they alternately patronise and flatter. Has it never occurred to them to ask whether the working man will always be content to remain a lay figure in the battle of politics? Are they vain enough to suppose that the men to whom power has been given will go to them to ask how they shall use it? The poorer orders have been told that they work hard in order that others may live in ease, and they will see for themselves that their hardships are not to be removed by allowing others to stand in the places which they might fill themselves. The new electors are little understood by the Radicals. It is easy to declaim over their fictitious wrongs at public meetings where only speakers of one side are allowed to be heard; but how many of these carpet politicians have succeeded in drawing near enough to them to understand their turn of thought, their opinions on social questions, their ideas

ideas of personal interest? 'If,' remarks Mr. Mill with great justice, 'you wish to know what is practically a man's interest, you must know the cast of his habitual feelings and thoughts.' In other countries it has been found that when power is given to men they begin to use it for their own advantage; and is it not partly for that very purpose that it is given to them? But the English working men, we are told, are so different. They will not care to help themselves; they will help the man who shouts out the loudest that he is their only friend. We shall see how that complacent theory will look a few years hence. Our belief is, that the incoming electors may be depended on to appraise the services of their 'deliverers' at their true value. In justice to their intelligence, we must anticipate that they will decline to take their opinions, ready labelled, from the hand of friend or foe. They will look for and find leaders in their own circles, and it is natural that they should do so. A carpenter may reasonably consider that his son is as much entitled to office, and upon the whole as fit for it, as an undisciplined lordling or a misanthropic professor. The present Radicals cannot prevent that train of reasoning from producing logical consequences. They are now parcelling out the new inheritance among each other, in total forgetfulness that the rightful owner is on his way to it; or perhaps they have persuaded themselves that when he arrives he will applaud their division. We know not what changes may be before us; but if the time should come when it will be necessary to choose between a fair and just-minded mechanic who truly understands his class, and a political adventurer who wishes to rise to power on his shoulders, no rational man will hesitate on which side to cast his vote.

ART. VIII.—1. *Erinnerungen an Wilhelm von Humboldt.* Von Gustav Schlesier. 2 parts. New edition. Stuttgart, 1854.

2. *Wilhelm von Humboldt, Lebensbild und Charakteristik.* Von R. Haym. Berlin, 1856.

3. *Ueber die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java, nebst einer Einleitung über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwickelung des Menschengeschlechts.* Von Wilhelm von Humboldt. 3 vols. Berlin, 1836-9 (also in the Abh. der K. Akademie der Wissenschaften).

4. *Wilhelm von Humboldt's Gesammelte Werke.* 7 vols. Berlin, 1841-52.

5. *The Sphere and Duties of Government.* Translated from the German

German of Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, by Joseph Coulthard, Jun. London, 1854.

6. *Briefe von Wilhelm von Humboldt an eine Freundin.* Ed. in 1 vol. Leipzig, 1860.
7. *Letters of William von Humboldt to a Female Friend.* A complete edition translated from the second German edition, by Catharine M. A. Couper. 2 vols. London, 1849.
8. *Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Wilhelm von Humboldt.* Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1830.

THE name of Humboldt, thanks to the world-wide reputation of the author of 'Cosmos,' is quite familiar to English ears. But of the thousands to whom this name carries high authority on any scientific question, scarce half even know that Alexander von Humboldt, the traveller and writer on natural science, had an elder brother, William von Humboldt, the critic, statesman, and philologist. Worse than being merely ignored is the treatment this latter receives from those who have heard of him, and describe him as 'the brother of the great Humboldt.' In truth, a distinguished man who happens to have a brother yet more famous than himself, is apt to suffer in his own fame from a connexion which leaves him to all time the victim of an odious comparison. William von Humboldt was one of the leaders of the German literary world of the time of Goethe, that period of an intense and vigorous life which has since so much subsided. He was one of the small group of men whose genius and enormous industry established the German school of comparative philology. The hard years which came before and after the fall of Napoleon were times to try the strength and skill of a politician, but Talleyrand said of Humboldt that the Europe of his day had not counted three or four such statesmen, and appraised still higher his power as a diplomatist by grumbling that he could not quite see through him—there was something peculiar in his character that he did not understand. Now the only English biography of this very notable man, which is an abridgment of Schlesier's German work, is bound up with a similar sketch of the life of his brother Alexander. With a perfect appreciation of the relative rank the two hold in England, Alexander, the younger, is placed first, and William's life forms a second part, carried on from the time when his career diverges from that of his more celebrated brother.

To make a comparison of these two men, as being the one greater and the other less, is, as it happens, out of the question. Both were many-sided in a high degree, but they divided the field of knowledge between them, working up to one another's boundaries,

boundaries, but seldom passing over into common ground. We have here to speak of William only, and call him 'Humboldt' simply for convenience, with no idea of claiming back for him the right of the first-born, in which his younger brother has once for all supplanted him. His political career, too, lies beyond our present scope; we cannot even discuss the morality of the annexation of half Saxony by Prussia at the Congress of Vienna, in which Humboldt was a main actor. What we wish to do is simply to examine Humboldt's life and writings, going to other sources only for help to understand more thoroughly his books and himself.

Humboldt has been dead these thirty years, and some of his works even go back into the last century. It might seem at first as though they would have surely been by this time superseded and left behind, and as if to drag them out and criticise them now would be a historical task, a piece of literary antiquarianism. But it is not so at all; years have, indeed, scarcely altered the place and positive value of his writings, which for the most part still stand forward as modern books, written from the highest levels of modern knowledge. In part this permanence may be due to his having written on speculative subjects which the current of positive science has not yet caught up in its course, and on which the opinion of a modern European may be about as good as his great-grandfather's, and Aristotle's possibly better than either. But in other things, as in his philological researches, he performed the extraordinary feat of thrusting himself a whole generation forward by sheer skill and hard work; making his way into districts so remote and difficult that his successors have as yet seldom fully come up with him, and still more seldom passed him by.

Baron 'Carl Wilhelm von Humboldt' was born at Potsdam in 1767, two years before his brother, Baron 'Friedrich Heinrich Alexander von Humboldt.' The two brothers were educated together at home, went to the same universities, and started thence on their diverging courses in life with a wonderful combination of the requisites of success—genius, immense power of work, wealth, and social position. At twenty William was in the midst of that Berlin literary society which, owing its rise to Frederick the Great and his court, so curiously combined 'enlightened' views, as they were called, with a gushing sentimentalism whose outpourings we read of with a wondering amusement now. The Jewish influence which had come down from the time of Moses Mendelssohn was strong in this society; among the female leaders was the celebrated Jewess, Henriette Herz, and in it the young Humboldt soon became a light. Endless

Endless talk concerning the ideal, boundless enthusiasm, platonic friendship, were the order of the day. The social circle brought forth at last a wondrous thing, a mystic secret society, a Bond of Virtue, which was to promote reciprocal education, moral and spiritual, and to combine the morality of man with the sensibility of woman. The order had its statutes; its members broke through ceremonial restrictions, and thou'd and thee'd one another; a secret cipher was invented, and in it distant members uttered their souls by correspondence. The solemn council met, and chose Humboldt to be one of the order. He went to his friend, the beautiful Henriette, and humbled himself before her; he felt himself unworthy, he had sunk sadly below their level of goodness and spirituality. The ladies, however, did not reject the penitent. He confessed himself, was absolved, and in solemn form initiated.

Droll as all this is, we should not forget that there was something good at the bottom of it. It was immensely silly, no doubt, but it was not of a depraved kind of silliness. The coterie of enthusiasts was deeply sensible (and well it might be) that its days were evil days, that its world was not what it ought to be, and with all sincerity it strove, according to its light, to make itself better and to form a better world around it. Humboldt's own sentimentalism did not fall off from him in late years, though it became more sober, and was held in with a tighter hand. Its influence on his character was most evidently for good; it joined itself to his highest qualities, his strong sense of duty, his private affection, and his public spirit, while in practical business and scientific research it was quite powerless to hinder him from judging as keenly and acting as firmly as the hardest man who ever dealt with hard facts, and with nothing in the world beside.

A little later, Humboldt's passion for the society of clever and attractive women found a new object. He went to Göttingen, and studied there under Heyne, the well-known editor of Virgil. Heyne had a daughter Therese, wife of Georg Forster, a somewhat noted man in Germany, but best known in England as having gone at seventeen with Captain Cook on his second voyage, and written a good account of it at twenty. Therese Forster and Humboldt soon became intimate, and he wrote to Berlin to Henriette Herz describing her in the most enthusiastic terms. Now the Berlin ladies knew of what Humboldt's later biographer describes as a 'female being' not unlike Therese, and, as it were, made on purpose for their friend. She could not be described as personally handsome; she was, indeed, in some way slightly deformed; but she had brilliant eyes and a beautiful and expressive

expressive face, she was brimful of enthusiasm and romance, learned and yet withal thoroughly feminine. It may be that it was really through the help of the Berlin 'Bond of Virtue' that Humboldt came to marry Caroline von Dacheröden; if so, the sentimental society did an excellent work, for she was a good and charming woman, and their life was one of the most unclouded happiness. In 1791, abandoning an unsatisfactory attempt at a public career, Humboldt married her, and settled down to study and write through ten years of pleasant, unshackled private life.

In the next year he wrote his first important work, about which, and his own personal concerns, he tells his friend Forster in a long letter. He has a little daughter, he says, not yet a fortnight old, but very large and strong for her age, full of life and fun, and with wondrous great blue eyes that she rolls continually round and round in her head. He and Caroline are always together, and the baby hardly comes into any other hands than theirs. He is working meanwhile at his usual studies, and discussing political philosophy with the Coadjutor von Dalberg, 'the only man here whom one can call interesting.' It had happened, the writer goes on to say, that he had sent a letter some while before to a friend, about the new French constitution, and this letter had got printed in the 'Berliner Monatschrift.' Thereupon Dalberg had asked him to go more fully into these matters, and to set forth at length his views on the general principles of government, and the result was a little book, which he and Dalberg had carefully gone through and discussed piece by piece together.

Humboldt's knowledge of the new order of things in France had not altogether come to him at secondhand. Three years before, as a young man of two-and-twenty, he had visited Paris at a very notable time. The French guards had sided with the people, the Bastile had been taken, and the great Revolution had fairly set in. Among the Germans who looked forward with enthusiastic hope to the new and golden times that seemed coming in France was Campe, a former tutor of Humboldt's. He planned an excursion to see, as he said, 'the funeral of French despotism,' and with him went his former pupil and another companion. They reached Paris on the 3rd of August, the day before the famous sitting of the Assembly which overthrew the aristocratic system at a blow. On the 12th they went to Versailles and saw Mirabeau. That day and the next they were at the sittings of the National Assembly, heard the debate on the address to the King, its reading, the King's reply, and the Te Deum which solemnised the beginning of a new world in France.

The

The elder traveller was in ecstacy, the grand ideas which were but talked of in Germany were being acted here. Light and Truth had broken forth into the world, and the empire of Reason had begun at last. But the younger, not less devoted to such ideas, was too good a judge of men and things to believe that what he saw in Paris was the real embodiment of Light, and Truth, and Reason, and he came home foreboding evil days. Two years later, in August, 1791, when Mirabeau was dead, and the King and Queen had been stopped in their flight and brought back to Paris, and the National Assembly was hard at work creating a new constitution, Humboldt wrote the letter above mentioned.*

The National Assembly, he says, has undertaken to set up a new organisation of the State, based on mere principles of reason. Granting it possible to set up such a system, it can never thrive, for it is necessary that any new constitution must follow upon the constitution that goes before it, and here in the place of a system simply contrived to extract from the people as much means as possible to satisfy the ambition and profusion of one man, there is to come a system which has no object but the freedom, repose, and happiness of every individual. Two totally opposed conditions are thus to follow one upon the other, where then is the chain that is to link them together? Our theoretical notions on matters of experience are after all but imperfect and half-true ideas, what reason has to do in the matter is to strive not to create, but to guide aright the course of actual events. No doubt, he thinks, good will come of the attempt thus to realise an ideal constitution, but all analogy of history goes against its direct and practical success.

In the larger work on the 'Limits of the Action of the State,' † Humboldt goes more fully into some matters only touched upon in the letter, and lays down a theory of government, headed by an appropriate motto from Mirabeau; 'Le difficile est de ne promulguer que des lois nécessaires, de rester à jamais fidèle à ce principe vraiment constitutionnel de la Société, de se mettre en garde contre la fureur de gouverner, la plus funeste maladie des gouvernemens modernes.' Men have been so occupied, he says, in settling the details of government, that a question which seems naturally to come first has been but very imperfectly and inaccurately treated—what, namely, is the object of Government and what are the limits of its action? Is the State to occupy itself merely with the security of its citizens, or with the whole physical and moral well-being of the nation? Lawgivers, statesmen, political writers, have mostly taken the latter view,

* Werke, vol. i. pp. 301-311. † Ibid. vol. vii. pp. 1-188.

and

and the world has come to be governed accordingly; but is it the true view? The matter, he thinks, wants closer looking into. Man's object in life, he holds, is to develop himself, to exercise all his powers in the highest and best-proportioned way. For this, his first and indispensable requisite is freedom. But even the freest and most independent of men, if thrown into a mechanical uniformity and monotony of life, is hindered in his proper growth. What he wants is not only freedom of action, but also variety of scope. That he may have both of these, what ought to be done for him by the State of which he is a member? This problem the young student addressed himself to solve in the midst of his leisurely country life, far from the jarring contact of the great world, but, as it seems, by no means uninfluenced by the glimpse he had lately had of official life in Berlin, and of the actual working of a thoroughly 'paternal' Government.

Is the State, he asks, to provide for the physical well-being of its citizens, to attend to the amount of population, to support the needy, to encourage agriculture, manufactures, trade, and so forth? All such action, he holds, does direct harm, it produces an artificial machine-like uniformity at the cost of independence of character and action. Such a State strives toward an end which is not a worthy end of human life. It labours to bring about a condition of repose and outward prosperity; but what really ought to be striven for is something very different; we want to make the individual citizen a strong and skilful man, capable of varied thought and action. A system that takes from the individual the control of his own concerns, in its sedulous care for what the man produces and possesses, forgets something far more important—the man himself. Allowed freely to exercise their strength and energy, men should be left of themselves to make their country populous, rich, and happy.

Thus the whole institution of State Education is open to the gravest objection. Government, if it manages or controls teaching, must at least favour a particular system. Education is thus liable to become a political engine, made to turn out to order citizens of one set pattern, thus stunting individual development. If it keeps clear of this vice, and sets itself merely to make men, then it wants no assistance from Government, for among a free people professions thrive, art flourishes, science grows. Among such a people, parents have at once more ability and more desire to give their children the benefits of education, and with such a state of things there will be no want either of careful family training, or of good and useful schools. Is the State, then, to occupy itself with the religion of its citizens? ought

ought it to support and propagate some particular theological system? By no means; a man's religion is a matter for his own judgment and feeling, and not to be thrust upon him by authority; indeed everything that concerns religion lies without the limits of State action, and not the appointment of the preacher only, but the whole arrangement of divine service in general, ought to be left freely to the congregation with no interference from the Government. Again, is the State to control public morals, to compel its members to do what is good for them, to make laws to restrain luxury and excess? By no means; the more such laws accomplish their purpose, the more hurtful will they become, for a nation forced by law into a course of outward moral action and abstinence is but a slavish crowd. Compulsion weakens moral strength, while it forms no real inward virtue, brings man no nearer to moral perfection. What then is the State to do, if all these functions, so generally held to belong to it, are to be stripped away? We need not go into the details of the answer. Its duty is to defend the nation from enemies abroad, and at home to secure the rights of the individual in person and estate. But it does not follow that because this is what a State should be, therefore existing governments should be overthrown, and this better system established in their place. Humboldt was no believer in Utopias, but held that reform should be effected by successive development, each stage rising naturally from the one below, and thus, far from proposing his theory of government as a scheme for adoption, he was careful to explain that he did no more than set up an ideal towards which the minds of thinking men were to tend in their efforts for the gradual improvement of society.

When Humboldt sent his treatise to Berlin to be printed, the censorship naturally enough made difficulties; and by the time his friend Schiller had found him a publisher, the author himself began to feel less sure of his opinion. Some fragments were inserted at the time in literary journals, but the book was never published as a whole till 1851,* nearly sixty years after it was written, and sixteen after its author's death. As a very able statement of the theory of 'self-government' in its most extreme form, it was soon translated into English. Towards the close of 1867, a French translation appeared in Paris, with a preface, in which M. Chrétien, the translator, gives his view of Humboldt, and his effect on the political thought of Europe. Many of the best of these ideas of Humboldt's lie so deep in the English

* 'Ideen zu einem Versuch, die Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Staates zu bestimmen.' Breslau, 1851. It is also included in the Werke, vol. vii. (1852.)

 political

political consciousness, that such a publication here would have no particular significance. Our tendency towards a realisation of his scheme is, in fact, sometimes hastier than our national training warrants; and so it comes to pass that people cast blame on the principle of self-government, and even sigh for the conveniences of a paternal system, when the real question is one of detail concerning the fitness of particular organisations to particular ends. Self-government by educated and responsible citizens is not to be discarded because government by Boards of Guardians may reach no very high ideal, and because government by 'roughs' is a thing to be suppressed without troubling ourselves about ideals at all. But in France, opinion ranges in two opposite directions far outside our narrower limits, and there nothing could be more salutary than the influence of Humboldt. He stands serenely midway between socialism and imperialism, with his face turned toward neither, but toward an ideal future more possible than the one and better than the other, although itself not even to be desired in every detail, and hardly destined to more than a partial accomplishment.

Humboldt wrote no more theoretical politics after this. He was a good many years older when he became himself a working statesman, and we fear it must be admitted that in office he proved himself by no means a thorough-going Humboldtist. He practically admitted that the interference of Government, though perhaps needless and even hurtful among a nation more capable of shifting for itself, might yet be expedient under existing circumstances. In 1809 we find him Minister of Public Worship and of Public Instruction, working with all his might to get the Pestalozzian method of education, then a new and strange system, brought into operation by the State throughout the country. Nor was he occupied alone with elementary education. He took a large share in the improvement of the higher schools. At a time when Prussia had sunk into a deplorable state of poverty and disorganisation, means were nevertheless provided to found the new University of Berlin, and of this undertaking Humboldt was a chief promoter. In practical work of this kind he seems to have followed a middle course between his early ideal of the absolute non-interference of the State, and the cramping, meddling, bureaucratic system of ordinary Prussian government. He found, for instance, a law that forbade a Prussian to study at a foreign university, and abolished it. In the choice of professors for the Berlin University, he tried to secure general ability rather than a uniform system of instruction. Fichte, Schleiermacher, De Wette, Savigny, Klaproth, Niebuhr, Wolf, and Böckh, among others, were a set of men at any rate not wanting in

in intellectual power. Of course discretion had to be used in keeping out men who, though capable, were too eccentric for practical purposes. Thus Humboldt refused Steffens a chair of Natural Philosophy, not because he was not clever, but because he was a mystic; and Steffens, years later, abundantly justified his own exclusion by lecturing in Berlin about the connexion of the obliquity of the Ecliptic with the Fall of Man, an ancient and respectable theory indeed, but somewhat out of place in a discourse on natural philosophy in the 19th century.

> 'Some say, he bid his angels turn askance
> The poles of earth, twice ten degrees and more,
> From the sun's axle; they with labour push'd
> Oblique the centric globe.'

The Berlin University proved a great success, and the highest credit is due to the patriotism that could spare time and money for such a work in those trying times. It was objected that the capital was an unsuitable place for a university, in which the professors would be so much exposed to political influences, and the students thrown among the temptations of a great city, but these objections do not seem to have been well founded. There is reason to think that it has been good for Berlin to have this important intellectual body in its midst; good for the professors to be thrown into contact with men of other avocations, and good for the students to live in a city where they are not of enough importance to be exempted from common decency of behaviour, and where the police at any rate will not allow them to reel ten abreast down the streets as they do at Heidelberg, making night hideous with their frantic howling.

Thus, in deeds, if not in words, Humboldt gave judgment on his early essay on government, by himself using the power of the State as a means of furthering the education of the people. Moreover, having then laid it down that interference with religion was not within the province of the State, he now became himself official head of the Department of Public Worship. The position was an anomalous one, for though Humboldt was a man of deep religious feeling, his Christianity must be defined as a Christianity without a church and without a creed. Still, holding religion in some form or other to be necessary to mankind, and at least sympathising strongly with Christian feeling and action, he in every way supported his colleague Nicolovius, who was working not only to control and maintain an existing system, but to 'create a new organisation in his department with the view of re-awakening the nation to religious belief.' We even find Humboldt acting independently in the

promotion of public worship, by recommending the appointment of an official inspector of music, and the establishment of a University church to serve as a pattern for the country at large. 'For that the University,' he says, 'should have its own church, appears to me indispensably necessary, seeing that the youthful mind ought least of all to be left without religious influence at a time when it is especially open to receive it, and when, too, science is apt to form in but a one-sided way the understanding alone.' *

We have no wish to discuss independently here the questions of State Education and State Religion, but merely to show how Humboldt thought, and how he acted upon them. Doing this has necessarily brought us far on in his life. To examine another group of his writings, we must go back to an earlier time.

While Humboldt was yet a student, he lived much among a literary and artistic circle. When he came back at twenty-three from his visit to Paris in 1789, he travelled through Germany and Switzerland, seeing nature and at the same time studying men. In those times, he says in a letter written many years later, 'I had a kind of passion for coming close to interesting men, looking at many, and at those carefully, so as to form in my mind a picture of their ways and nature. Thus I early gained an acquaintance with men, which to most is wanting much later in life. What I cared for especially was to understand them. I used them as material for general ideas, classified them, compared them, studied their physiognomy; in short, made, as far as it would go, a special study of them.' † Among the literary men he met with on this journey, was one whose name still keeps a certain interest in England. Writing to Forster, he tells him how he went to Zurich to see Lavater, full of expectation of meeting, if an enthusiast, at any rate a man of genius. He found a small literary trifler, wanting in real learning, and negligent of any notions but his own, with now and then indeed a deep quick glance of thought, but so egotistical, so conceited, so given up to verbal quibbles and dull sickly scraps of sentiment, as to have no time or strength for better things. Humboldt, staying often alone in Lavater's study, wondered greatly at certain pasteboard cases, which filled a great part of his bookshelves. They were labelled 'Important Letters,' 'Letters from others,' 'Letters to Youths,' &c., and on some were the names of acquaintances, male and female. It appeared that Lavater's fancy was to sort in these cases such of his compositions as

* Werke, vol. v. p. 321.

† 'Briefe an eine Freundin,' p. 125.

might

might be interesting to the persons in question, and on the last day he let Humboldt see the contents of one case, which bore the name of a lady whom he knew well; it proved to be a collection of the dullest imaginable little verses, written neatly out on sheets of fine paper with ornamented borders. 'I cannot conceive,' Humboldt says, 'when the man can possibly get at any real matter, considering the time that the form costs him.' *

When he grew older, Humboldt's literary associates were men of higher power than Lavater and Forster. Living in close intimacy with Schiller and Goethe, he helped as a friend and adviser in their work. Of his own poetry much is to be found in his collected works, but he himself sent very little of it out into the world, and his compositions mostly date from his later years, when it became his habit, as his brother Alexander relates, day by day to shape into verse the thoughts and feelings of a mood 'less of melancholy than of solemnity and pathos.' It would be a task to read these poems through; Humboldt had no ear for music, and little poetic fire, and his sonnets are rather rhymed and measured prose than real poetry. In this field, as his friend Schiller candidly tells him in one of his letters, his turn of mind was such as fitted him not to produce, but to criticise and to enjoy. One great qualification he had for appreciating art and poetry: he was in the strongest sense of the word an idealist, living in an ideal world of his own, using the facts of experience as mere gross material to be shaped into ideal forms. Into the real world, he said, 'there enter disturbing forces, but the imagination draws nearer to ideas; and pure ideas, visible only to the inward eye, are of all things that man can know the greatest and most beautiful. To live in them is true enjoyment, happiness with no admixture of cloud. It is true that few men have this sense, for to it belongs a contemplative tendency, impossible in men with whom sensuousness and ethical perception pass into a longing for actuality and enjoyment. From this longing I have been all my life very free, and thus have had more delight in both inward and outward contemplation, and in both, unyielding to deceitful appearance, have the more fully recognised truth.' † The man who could thus very truly describe his own mental state, was clearly well placed for the appreciation of poetry and art. Taking for his text one of the most perfect creations of the modern world, Goethe's 'Hermann and Dorothea,' he could show how the poet's art could bring into definite form 'shapes so true and individual, as only nature and the living present time could give, and withal so pure and ideal,

* Werke, vol. i. p. 283.

† 'Briefe an eine Freundin,' p. 29.

as

as the real world can never place before us,' so that 'in the mere telling of a simple story we can discern the true and perfect figure of the world and of humanity.' *

Thus, too, when he writes on the theory of art, and will not be put off with a mere generalisation of individual forms, but claims something more, an ideal of human beauty, he can justify himself by pointing to the works of the Greek sculptor, who can show the existence of such a conception in his mind by realising it in marble, and thus can individualise the ideal itself. Humboldt indeed wanted more than even the Greek sculptor could succeed in producing for him. In his straining after ideal unity, the contrast of the sexes came inconveniently in his way. What he wanted was to 'fuse together in thought the characteristic qualities of both sexes, and out of the inmost union of pure manliness and pure womanliness to shape humanity.' † Of such notions as this of course nothing can come but mere suppression of differences, and the idealist goes beyond the limits even of his wide domain when he undertakes to blend the incompatible. It is curious to notice that another thinker, whose works are now occupying a large place in the world's thought, went into this problem and came out of it much worse than Humboldt did. Humboldt's ideal of humanity was simply an impalpable abstraction. Auguste Comte's is concrete enough at all events, and the world will not soon forget his proposal to set up as the ideal of humanity on the banner of the great Western Republic, the figure of a woman of thirty, bearing her son in her arms.

In 1802, Humboldt re-entered public life and went as Prussian Minister to Rome. There for six years he led a life after his own heart. The modern Romans had of course little intellectual life to offer, 'they write a new book here in one five years,' he said, 'and then talk about it for five years more.' He wrote to Madame de Staël, who quotes the remark in 'Corinne,' that 'in Rome all is foreign, even the Romans, who seem to dwell there, not like owners, but like pilgrims taking their rest among the ruins.' But there were many congenial men among the foreign residents, and Humboldt's house became, as it continued to be through the years of his official life, a centre for the best of intellectual society. The official duties of the Prussian Minister were but light, they bore to the thoughts and interest which really filled his mind somewhat the same proportion that the Rome of the present bears to the Rome of the great past. His tastes and sympathies were so bound up with classical history

* 'Ueber Göthe's Hermann und Dorothea.' Werke, vol. iv. p. 14.
† 'Ueber die männliche und weibliche Form.' Werke, vol. i. p. 216.

and

and literature, he was himself so thoroughly a man of the classical renaissance, that Rome was still to him the centre of the world.

In 1808 Humboldt returned to Germany, and soon after took the office in the Home Government of which we have already spoken. In 1809 the Pope was carried off to France, and Humboldt's place as Prussian Minister at Rome was only filled up in 1816, when Niebuhr succeeded him, to be followed in his turn by Bunsen. In 1810 Humboldt was appointed to the embassy at Vienna: in 1813 he represented Prussia at Prague; and again, in 1814, at Chatillon. A little later he signed with Hardenberg the treaty of peace at Paris, and the two were together Prussian plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Vienna in the same year. In 1818 he came as ambassador to London; in 1819 he returned to Berlin and re-entered the Home Government as one of the two Ministers of the Interior. This was the end of his public career: he was a staunch supporter of Constitutional Government; and the reactionary party which had then, as it has since, gained the ascendency in Prussian politics, was strong enough to dismiss him from office in the same year that he entered it. Nothing loth, he returned to private life, to compare the dialects of the Malays and South Sea Islanders, and to contemplate the ideal world which, to him, so far surpassed in interest and importance the concerns of public business. Such matters he had always treated as mere accessories to his inner nature. Were it not, he said, for learning and ideas, official papers would be a man's utter ruin.

Appropriately enough, the pre-eminence of the ideal over the actual world is scarcely brought so strongly into view in anything Humboldt ever wrote as in a short discourse 'On the Office of the Historian,'* read before the Berlin Academy in 1820, as if to mark the moment of his release from the thraldom of fact into the freedom of unshackled contemplation. He never wrote history himself, but he had been engaged in making it on rather a large scale; and what with experience, and what with study, it seemed to him that he might set forth to actual historians the conditions and the method of their business. He begins by comparing the historian with the artist and the poet; both have mere actuality to look on, but an internal sense enables them to show forth something deeper and truer. 'As philosophy strives after the first principles of things, and art after the ideal

* 'Ueber die Aufgabe des Geschichtsschreibers.' Abh. der K. Akad. der Wissensch.; and in Werke, vol. i. pp. 1-25.

of

of beauty, so history strives to depict human destiny in its truth, living completeness, and purity, apprehended by a mind so directed to its object that the views, feelings, and claims of personality are in it lost and dissolved.' And our comprehension of events is not to be held as including nothing beyond what is to be learnt from the experience and study of the actual world. When the historian has exhausted the observation of such causes as climate, art, knowledge, natural character, law, and government, and the like, there remains beyond a something mightier, not manifesting itself to immediate observation, but giving to these very forces their start and direction; and this something is in the ideas which lie without the range of the finite, but penetrate through and rule the history of the world in all its parts. These ideas manifest themselves in history; and the historian's task, in its last and simplest expression, is to show the effort of the idea to obtain existence in actuality. We call this sort of speculation in England not history, but philosophy of history. But perhaps the most interesting feature in Humboldt's discourse upon it, is the way in which he describes and advocates that idealistic treatment of facts which modern historians would mostly disclaim, but which, unexpressed and even hidden as it is, can be discerned by their readers underlying even what looks at first sight like the barest statement of recorded facts. There are very striking passages in Humboldt's discourse; but we miss in it that continual reference of point after point to the test of actual example, which alone can bring into the vague dissertation on influences, causes, and developments, a definite and certain meaning.

The rest of Humboldt's life was mostly devoted to his investigations in the field of Comparative Philology. But during the twenty years which intervened between the Congress of Vienna and his death, he wrote, without the least thought of doing anything of the kind, the one book which has given him a place, and that a high one, among the popular writers of Germany. It would be superfluous to enter here into any full discussion of a book so long and popularly known to the world in the original and in translation as the 'Letters to a Lady;' but the extraordinary circumstances under which these letters were written are only partially given in ordinary English sources; and, with the aid of Haym's biography, we may tell afresh the strange and romantic story of Charlotte Diede.

While Humboldt was still a student at Göttingen, he made an excursion to the baths of Pyrmont, and there his place at the *table d'hôte* was next to a country pastor and his daughter, Charlotte,

Charlotte, a girl of seventeen, some four years younger than Humboldt himself. They became at once inseparable friends, and for three long summer days, from early till late, they walked up and down the valleys and along the avenues; and the student and the pastor's daughter could never end their interchange of thoughts and feelings. On the fourth day Humboldt went away, leaving in Charlotte's heart an ineffaceable impression, and in her album an inscription that 'The feeling of the true, the good, and the beautiful, ennobles the soul and gives bliss to the heart; but what is such a feeling without a sympathetic soul to share it with? Never have I been so keenly and so deeply penetrated with the truth of this thought as at this moment, when, with but uncertain hope of meeting again, I must part from you.' Both were overflowing with the high-wrought sentiment of their time; but what served only to give a greater charm to his strong and independent character, led her on to the wreck of her whole life's happiness. It seems that when she was at Pyrmont with Humboldt, she was already privately betrothed, though she did not include this in her confidence to her new friend. The next year, neither for love, nor rank, nor money, but characteristically enough from a morbid feeling of affection for another girl, she married a man for whom she cared nothing. Then, too late, she found another who seemed to be the fit object of an ideal friendship. For him she took a step which hopelessly compromised her reputation, and left her husband, only to find, instead of a romantic friend, a mere vulgar admirer, who persecuted her with his addresses till she made her escape from him, as she had done from her husband, and took refuge in Brunswick. There, after the battle of Jena, she invested most of her little competence in the government loan, and was left almost penniless. Whatever were the faults of her character, neither helplessness nor want of courage were among them; she settled in Cassel, where King Jerome then held his court, and gained her living by making artificial flowers, till at last the French power came to an end, the German Elector and his court returned; and, as if Charlotte Diede had not had punishment enough already, society turned against her, and her little trade fell away. Destitute, in broken health, and almost despairing, she wrote to her friend of six-and-twenty years before, now, as she saw by the newspapers, Prussian plenipotentiary at the Congress of Vienna. She sent him the leaf out of her album, and appealed to him for advice and aid. He answered her letter instantly; and, in the most affectionate terms, gave her the advice she wanted, and helped her through her difficulties till, with health somewhat restored,

restored, she could go on turning her skill in flower-making to successful account. He was not a man who changed; years seldom moved a feeling that had taken root in his mind, and he took up the old friendship again with an often-expressed sense of the liveliest pleasure that the pastor's daughter had kept for him, through these painful years, the impressions of her first love at Pyrmont. He seems to have seen her two years later at Frankfort; but, till he left office, he was too busy to do much more than write needful communications about her affairs. Then he began the long correspondence which to him was a pleasure, looked forward to and arranged from month to month, while to her it was the absorbing interest of a life which without it had little to give but toil, suffering, and bitter recollection. Of her own letters we know almost nothing; his, she kept as her secret treasure, scarcely showing them for years, and hardly persuaded to allow a selection from them to be published after his death.

Nothing more fully justifies Rahel Levin's often-quoted saying about Humboldt, that he was 'of no age,' than do these letters. They hardly depend at all on local or temporary circumstances for their interest, and will be as readable a century hence as they are now. They contain little of passing events, and no gossip. The writer, indeed, may incidentally describe the scenery at Gastein, or a Quakers' meeting in London, or speak of the pleasant little house with the great garden round it, where Charlotte had established herself, and where he paid her a flying visit on his way to Paris with his family in 1828. But thoughts and feelings, his own favourite subjects of contemplation, are the main topics of his letters, and such talk, which from most men would be flat and wearisome, becomes interesting and suggestive in the highest degree when a man of Humboldt's powers and experience sets himself to write down to the level of the quick, thoughtful pastor's daughter. Here, too, are shown, better than in any outside view, Humboldt's own character, and his opinions, be they right or wrong, on nature, art, religion, man and the objects of his life in the world. He clings to the memory of the past, as of all possessions that which is most really his own; he studies to shape and develop his own character as the one thing he can carry with him into the next world, and thus life is truly to him one continual preparation for death. To his view, Providence concerns itself with some great and good, but inscrutable ends, of which the mere pleasure or pain of individuals forms no immediate part, and he even sometimes consoles himself in sorrow with the thought that his suffering is part of the working of the great organism. He holds that good

good should be enjoyed with all our power, and outward evil borne with calm resignation; but the main question is, not how much good a man should have and enjoy, but how good and noble his mind should be. He looks with contempt on the man who will do good that he may prosper by it, for to him the motive stands as high above the deed, as the ideal world stands above the world of action. To him the mere practical results of life are of little moment, it is a play to be played out; and the matter is far less what part the actor may have had dealt out to him, than how he is to fill it.

Some fifteen years after the beginning of the correspondence, a change comes in its tone. Humboldt's wife died in 1829, breaking by her death the tie which held him most closely to the world. She had been in the fullest sense a companion to him; her sympathy and influence had gone with him through all his varied labours; she had mediated between him and the social world, which he had been inclined to keep at a distance by a cold, harsh, sarcastic manner, very different from the genial kindness he reserved for his friends. When he speaks in one of his sonnets of their walks on the Campagna, the two casting but one shadow as they went, he happily depicts the unity of their life. After her death he secluded himself more and more among his solitary studies, seeking no new interests or pleasures, but living in memories of the past, and in looking forward to a future life. He was not quite sixty-eight when he died, six years later, at Tegel, on the 8th April, 1835. His brother Alexander outlived him nearly a quarter of a century.

Humboldt left unfinished at his death his greatest philological work, the occupation of many years. But the first steps in his philological career were made in early life. Merely mentioning his translations from Pindar and Æschylus, and his letters to Wolf, mostly relating to details of classical scholarship, we may here slightly notice his investigations on the Basque language. A Spanish journey in 1799 had excited his interest in the isolated race who still speak this remarkable and complex tongue, of which he began a thorough study on his arrival in Paris, returning to make a solitary journey among the valleys of the Pyrenees, in quest of fuller and more accurate information. The details which he contributed to the fourth volume of the 'Mithridates' are almost purely linguistic; but in a later treatise he brings forward very important ethnological results,* viz., that

* 'Prüfung der Untersuchungen über die Urbewohner Hispaniens vermittelst der Vaskischen Sprache.' Berlin, 1821; and in Werke, vol. ii.

the

the modern Basques represent in race and language the ancient Iberi, and that this race, now only distinctly surviving in the insignificant population of a few valleys north and south of the Pyrenees, once inhabited a vast area of south-western Europe, till stronger invading races destroyed or absorbed part of them, and drove the rest from their fertile plains. The evidence of this lies mostly in the names of places, and a single set of instances will show its nature. A Basque term for rock is *Asta*, and this word enters into many geographical names in the present Basque district,—Asta, Astobiza, Astorga, &c. Now Pliny mentions in the south of Spain one place called Asta, and two or three called Astigi, one of which is the present Ecija. Astapa means in Basque 'at the foot of the rock;' there is now a place with this name near Bilboa; and Livy mentions another in the south of the continent. Astura means in Basque 'rock-water;' thence the name of the river Astura, mentioned by Florus, the Astures, Asturica, and the modern Asturias. Thus it appears that the south of Spain was once inhabited by people speaking a Basque language, and calling the places where they dwelt by Basque names. This is the kind of reasoning lately used with much skill and success by Mr. Isaac Taylor in his 'Words and Places,' on the whole perhaps the most philosophical book on the use of geographical names in tracing early history. Humboldt's general conclusion is as follows: that the Iberi, of whom the modern Basques are the survivors, once inhabited the whole peninsula, over part of which a mixture with Celts formed the so-called Celtiberi, while etymological traces or historic records of an Iberian population are also to be found in Aquitaine, on part of the opposite Mediterranean coast, in Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily, possibly even on the Italian continent. It will be found, we think, that the evidence of early Iberian inhabitants, strong in north and south Spain and Aquitaine, is too fragmentary and doubtful for any certain conclusion as to other districts. The argument from the etymologies of names of places of course requires in its use great caution and a considerable number of cases to go upon; places get their names from so many causes, and it is so easy for a modern etymologist to find in any language he may choose a plausible explanation of what is probably only a corrupt or mutilated relic of an original designation. The labours of the native philologists who preceded Humboldt in this particular field were meritorious, but very unsafe. A linguist who starts with the theory that the original language of mankind was Basque, will probably go about as far wrong as if he had held it to be Hebrew, and a method

method which derives Asia from the Basque verb *asi*, to begin, because mankind began there, is likely to lead to conclusions wide rather than well-founded. The grammatical similarities in the structure of the Basque and of some American languages had already attracted Humboldt's attention, and thus he was led on to the study of the obscure philology of the native North American nations and tribes. To this subject he devoted much labour; but at last, a few years before his death, he found it impossible to do justice at once to this and the other branches of philology which he had taken up, and he gave over his American materials and results to a younger student, Dr. Buschmann, now Director of the Royal Library at Berlin, who has founded upon them a series of researches of great ethnological importance.*

Humboldt was past middle life when he took up the study of Sanskrit, then only beginning to be known in Europe, but which has mainly caused the rise of the science of Comparative Philology, as distinguished from the vague groping and guessing of former days. He did not do much as a pure Sanskritist, but the study led him into the Malay field which he worked with such success, and it gave him that grasp of the theory of grammatical structure which it seems hardly possible to gain except from seeing language, as it were, taken to pieces in the Sanskrit grammar. Without it, his Treatise on the Theory of Language, with all its faults perhaps the most important of his works, could hardly have been written at all. The treatise in question is placed as an introduction to the voluminous work which merely professes in its title to discuss the Kawi language of the island of Java, but which really forms a systematic treatise on the so-called Malayo-Polynesian family of languages. Only the first book was printed in Humboldt's lifetime, and the rest were finished by Buschmann, with corrections and additions of his own. As it is not our present object to discuss Humboldt's views upon the Science of Language, to which we lately devoted a separate article,† we would only remark in passing, that this celebrated essay 'On the Variety of Structure of Human Speech, and its influence on the Mental Development of Mankind,' is more valuable in suggestion than conclusive in argument, though, in its surpassing originality and far-reaching speculation, it may often profit the working philologist most where it is the most unsound. In discussing questions of

* 'Abh. der K. Akad. der Wissensch.; Azt. Ortsnamen, 1852; Spuren der Azt. Spr. 1854,' &c. See Tr. Eth. Soc. London, vol. ii. 1863, p. 130.

† See 'Quarterly Review,' No. 238, 'The Science of Language;' and for some remarks on Humboldt's views,' see p. 408.

practic

practical philology, Humboldt is one of the most cautious and logical of reasoners. But in the field of speculation he is to be used, not followed. He will point out the roads leading to new and rich regions of discovery to those sober students who will set themselves resolutely to walk on the solid ground of inductive reasoning, not try to fly on ideal wings as he did. To follow out with success the lines of inquiry he has opened, is within the reach of many, but those who, tempted by its brilliant results in Humboldt's hands, attempt themselves to handle his speculative method, will, we think, seldom produce anything with it but volumes of mysticism at best, and mere dull barren verbiage at worst.

In looking over William von Humboldt's varied career, the thought often arises that, had he concentrated his power on any one object, his name might have been counted among the very greatest in history. That he did not do this was, however, neither due to want of knowledge nor to vacillation of purpose. We have seen that he had an ideal of life, and though he could of course do but little toward embodying his ideal in mankind at large, there was one life he could train and shape according to it,—his own. But in this ideal what we call civilisation held but a subordinate place. That society should be arranged with a view to the greatest material prosperity, the greatest enjoyment, the greatest perfection in manufactures, the greatest accumulation and diffusion of knowledge, was not the end he strove for. A manufacturing division of labour, earning its great results by making men grind out their lives in the repetition of monotonous detail in some dark corner of the world, was simply hateful to him. He wanted men to develop their human nature as a whole; not to do their most at any one thing by the sacrifice of the rest, but to take a free scope all around them; and what he wished others to do he did himself, letting his mind spread, this way and that, into the many spheres of thought and work which opened before him. He did great things in the world, it is true, but meaner men than he have done far greater; we may describe him in full accordance with his own theory of life, as a great man, who, happening to find important business in life set before him to do, did it accordingly as a matter of the merest practical detail. Even those who hold that Humboldt's standard of life was not the highest that a man should have, will yet allow that it was no ignoble one; and few men have ever made real, as he did in the whole shaping of his life and character, an ideal conception of what men ought to be.

ART.

ART. IX.—1. *Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the System of Purchase and Sale of Commissions in the Army.* (Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of her Majesty.) 1857.

2. *The Purchase System in the British Army.* By Sir Charles E. Trevelyan, K.C.B. 1867.

3. *Our Military Forces and Reserves.* By Major J. Millar Bannatyne. 1867.

THE system of purchase and sale of commissions in the army has long attracted much public attention. Royal Commissions have inquired into it; it has been debated in Parliament; has been much discussed in pamphlets and in the newspapers; and it is now again to be brought forward shortly in the House of Commons. It is important, therefore, that the arguments in favour of the purchase system should be prominently placed before the public previous to the discussion on Mr. Trevelyan's motion for its abolition; particularly as the subject seems still to be but little understood by the general public, who appear to have a vague notion that the practice is an immoral and degrading one, calculated to create idleness and extravagance in the army, and to tend to the discouragement of exertion or endeavour on the part of officers generally to qualify themselves by study and hard work for the duties of their profession: in short, as assumed by a late writer * on the subject, that 'purchase and professional qualification are antagonistic and incompatible principles.' There cannot be a greater error than this. It is as much as to say that a man with money must necessarily be a bad officer, and a man without money must necessarily be a good officer.

Every officer of any experience will at once admit that the question of professional qualification is quite independent of the possession of money, and that, as a rule, the rich officer is certainly quite as capable in every respect as the poor officer. There may be in this, as in every other matter, occasional exceptions, but as a general rule it will not be disputed by any one who knows anything of the officers of the British army, that their merits or demerits as officers are in nowise affected by the fact of their having a little more or a little less money.

The impression that the purchase system is immoral or degrading can only arise from ignorance of what that system really is. The popular idea seems, indeed, to be that the officer who has the longest purse can outbid his companions and buy pro-

* Sir Charles Trevelyan, K.C.B.

motion

motion over their heads; that officers can, in short, go into the promotion-market as they can into any other market and bid against each other for the article they require, the highest bidder obtaining the step in rank! That such an idea is totally erroneous need hardly be affirmed; yet it is necessary to show that it is so, as the error is widely spread, and is not only most injurious to the reputation of the army, but is sure to be used in the coming debate as an argument against purchase.

Now, what is the real state of the case? Simply this: that 'Crœsus' himself could not purchase a step over the head of his senior if that senior was able and willing to purchase the step. This is the law and the regulation; and any departure from it must be a matter of private arrangement between the officers concerned; such arrangement being moreover disapproved of at head-quarters, where certain checks have been established against it. Nor is this all. It is not sufficient, as is erroneously supposed, for an officer to possess the necessary money in order to enable him to purchase. He can only do so under certain conditions. He must have served a certain fixed period in his present rank. He must have passed a certain fixed examination while in the subaltern ranks, and he must have been pronounced qualified for promotion by his commanding officer and by the inspecting general officers under whom he has served. These rules apply equally to the purchasing and to the non-purchasing officer. It is therefore idle to assume, as so many persons (ignorant of the real facts) do assume, that the non-purchasing officer is superior in abilities and professional qualifications to the purchasing officer. He may or he may not be so. It is a mere matter of accident, and not in any way connected with the question of money.

Having thus cleared the way by showing the unsoundness of the popular idea that the practice of purchasing promotion is either immoral or degrading—having shown that money alone does not qualify an officer for promotion, but that certain fixed tests of qualification are required alike from the purchaser and from the non-purchaser, and consequently that there is no reason to suppose that the one should be, or is, a better or a worse officer than the other—we may now proceed to examine in detail the arguments brought forward by the advocates of abolition, and to consider the results which would necessarily follow from the adoption of their suggestions.

These arguments have been placed before the public in the fullest manner, in a pamphlet published last year by Sir Charles Trevelyan, who from long consideration of the question, and from peculiar advantages of official position and experience, is no doubt a formidable antagonist of the purchase system, and will

will probably be accepted as their champion by all who take his view of the question. The following observations shall therefore be chiefly confined to the consideration of the arguments adduced by him; and in the first place it may be observed that Sir Charles Trevelyan has mixed up with this question of purchase other matters which do not appear to be connected with it. For instance, he draws a very vivid picture of the evils of our system of recruiting. He gives us a 'return of corporal punishments,' and a return of 'deserters from the army.' He condemns 'army agencies,' and the system of 'colonelcies of regiments;' criticises the half-pay list, and finally calls to his help the Irish constabulary, Fenianism, and the English volunteers.

These are all very proper topics for discussion, and there is probably a good deal of truth in what Sir Charles says about many of them, but their connexion with the system of purchase is not very obvious. Soldiers will desert; soldiers will get punished; the Irish constabulary will be faithful; Fenians will be rebels, and the English volunteers will continue to flourish whether purchase be or be not permitted in the British Army.

The system of recruiting may indeed in appearance, though not in reality, have some connexion with the subject of purchase; that is to say, viewing the matter in the light in which Sir Charles Trevelyan regards it; but the correctness of which we do not for a moment admit. His view is, that by the abolition of purchase, and by other arrangements, the army might be made a desirable profession for the middle classes, who would be induced to enlist in the ranks, in the hope of obtaining commissions and rising to the higher commands. Such a view appears to be entirely visionary. No inducement in the shape of a remote chance of obtaining a commission would be sufficient, in time of peace, to reconcile a well-educated young man of the middle class to all the hardships and deprivations of service in the ranks in an ordinary garrison town either abroad or at home. If some indeed were inclined to try their fortune in such a lottery, they would probably be so few in number as not to influence the general character of the bulk of the army, which must, under the voluntary system, always remain pretty much as it is. Where service in the ranks is wholly or partly compulsory, as in Prussia and in France, the case is different. In such armies there are always a considerable number of gentlemen by birth to be found in the ranks, but this will never be the case in a service like ours, except occasionally during a period of war; the proof of which is that in our non-purchase corps which already exist, namely, the navy, the marines, the artillery, and the engineers,

we do not find that the men before the mast, or in the ranks, are of that superior class contemplated by Sir Charles Trevelyan; nor is there a larger proportion of promotions to commissions from the ranks in those corps, or any lack of recruits in consequence. Arguing therefore from the known to the unknown, there is no reason to suppose that the abolition of purchase would have any effect in improving the material of the rank and file of our army. Nor is it perhaps desirable that this material should be improved. Major Bannatyne, in his pamphlet on 'Our Military Forces and Reserves,' speaks thus of our rank and file (p. 13):—

'The well-educated man would, no doubt, of the two, be the most easily trained, and perhaps in some degree he might excel the other in the performance of his duty; but the restraints of discipline would, as regards our countrymen at least, be more likely to disgust him. It is true to some extent, that by placing men possessed of higher intelligence and education in the army, we might make our code of discipline less rigid, especially during peace. But even during peace we could not venture to relax much, and enough would necessarily still remain that would be extremely distasteful to an educated man. During war, when men's passions are aroused, temptations increased, and many restraints removed; and when, above all, instant example is often wanted, an iron code imposing prompt personal penalties on offenders must ever be the rule, no matter how the army is composed. Again, when we consider the nature of the duty which the private soldier has to perform, the wearisome, and in themselves insignificant yet exacting details of which his daily occupation is necessarily made up, we cannot but feel that there is a limit to the degree of education and intelligence which is desirable. To an educated mind or high intelligence such duty would be as hateful as the treadmill, or grinding steel filings. During danger, hardship, or disaster, the educated man would be sustained by a sense of honour and duty; but long years of peace would, I think, try his endurance beyond its powers.

'I cannot help feeling and saying, although I know that the justice of both my reasoning and conclusion will be questioned, that the balance of advantage, even from the military point of view, lies with the class we employ at present rather than with any other.

'It cannot be denied that hitherto that class has served us well. I believe the British soldier is unequalled in the world. Our military history bears unvarying testimony to his merits. It names no one important failure or disaster which can fairly be laid at his door. On the contrary, it tells us of many battles he has won for us when generalship was at fault; and of many scrapes from which his reckless daring, stubborn endurance, unreasoning, or, if you will, unthinking habits of discipline and obedience, extricated us when blunders and mismanagement had made our case seem hopeless. He has the dash, "élan," of the Frenchman, the stubbornness and endurance of the Russian, with a tenacity of purpose and a contempt of odds against him

him which are peculiarly his own. He is generally an ignorant man I admit, but we have ever as yet found he had wit enough to learn his trade, although he never could learn to know when he was beaten. We shall do well to pause and consider before we decide to part with a servant who has served us so long, so faithfully, and so well.

'There are other points of view, subordinate certainly, but still of great importance, from which the question should be studied.

'The class which can be spared from the labour-market with least inconvenience to the country is the very class we employ at present. Not only is their labour of comparatively less value to the country than that of any other class, but their employment in military service is attended with some compensating advantages. It cannot be doubted that the bulk of the men who enlist in the military service would be likely, if denied that outlet, to lead idle and useless, and perhaps even in some cases criminal lives. Their useful employment in military duty, where their moral conduct is controlled, is therefore, if we must have soldiers, to some extent an obvious gain. Finally, the services of the class we now employ are procured on cheaper terms, looking merely to the cost of raising and maintaining our force, than those of any other would be.

'Military, economical, and financial considerations, therefore, appear, if I have truly stated them, to point to the same conclusion—that the present composition of the rank and file of our army is that which best suits both our military necessities and our national circumstances.'

Here, then, we have it as the opinion of an officer who, though of subordinate rank, has had much experience of soldiers, and has devoted his attention to the study of matters of this nature relating to his profession, that the class of soldiers now existing in the British army is better suited to our requirements than the higher class advocated by Sir Charles Trevelyan. We have no hesitation in expressing our concurrence with the opinion of the practical soldier in preference to that of the civilian.

If these views be admitted as correct, they at once dispose of the principal object which the opponents of purchase look to as the consequence of its abolition, namely, the opening of the ranks to the middle classes; for it follows from what has been stated above:—first, that there is no reason to suppose that the abolition of purchase would have the effect of inducing the middle class to enter the ranks of the army; secondly, that if it had that effect, it is very questionable whether the army would be benefited by it.

So much for the supposed influence which the abolition of purchase would have upon the composition of the rank and file of the army; let us now see what its effects would be upon the officers.

First, as to their 'status' or rank in life. Sir Charles Trevelyan affirms that the purchase system excludes from the commissioned ranks 'the large and important class of well-educated young men, who depend for their advancement upon their own exertions, and not upon their wealth and connexions, and who constitute the pith of the Law, the Church, the Indian Civil Service, and other active professions,' and he considers that men of that class who, under a different system, would enter the army as a profession, would be preferable to the present class of young men of birth and fortune.

Here we must beg leave to differ entirely from Sir Charles. Without at all objecting to the admission of young men of this class, many of whom by-the-by are already to be found in the army, we do not think that they are to be in any way preferred to the aristocratic officer. 'Blood' is a valuable quality in a man who has to lead others in the path of danger and difficulty. The great Duke of Wellington is said to have expressed a decided opinion in favour of the high-born aristocratic officer when any service was to be performed which required special dash; and it is well known in the service that the men themselves like to be led by the officer who is a 'gentleman born.' The presence in the army of men of high lineage, so far from being a disadvantage to the service, is quite the reverse. It tends to keep up that good breeding and gentlemanlike style which renders our officers so acceptable in society, and it may be an evil day for England when her officers shall descend from the high position they now occupy, to fill the lower place in society which is accorded to the subordinate officers of some of the continental armies. If the abolition of purchase should have the effect of excluding men of rank and noble birth from the army, and of generally lowering the 'status' of the officers, and substituting the democratic for the aristocratic element, there cannot in our opinion be a stronger argument against such abolition; we believe that as at present constituted the officers of the British army are as a body superior to those of any foreign army, and we would, therefore, in this case recommend the observance of the old adage, 'Let well alone.'

Let us next see how the system of purchase is regarded by those who are most affected by it—the officers themselves.

If it be not too presumptuous to suppose that the members of a profession (even though that profession be the army, upon which every civilian seems to consider himself competent to legislate) are likely to be the best judges of their own interests, let us hear what the opinion of the profession is.

Several Royal Commissions have been appointed to inquire into

into this matter. The first was in the year 1840. The late Duke of Wellington was a member of this Commission; it is to be hoped that the opinion of this great master of war may still be listened to with respect, notwithstanding the present tendency to disregard the experience of a former generation. That Commission reported strongly in favour of purchase, and declared that the practical advantages of the system had been proved by its effects during twenty-four years of peace. The condition of the Ordnance corps, where purchase does not obtain, was unfavourably contrasted in respect to the age and efficiency of the officers with that of the rest of the army. The next Royal Commission on Army Promotion was in the year 1854, and in their report they also unfavourably contrasted the age of the officers of the Ordnance corps with that of the rest of the army; and while recommending that the purchase system should not be disturbed, they advised that certain commands should be given by selection instead of by seniority.

In the year 1856, after the experience of the Crimean War, a third Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the same subject; after examining a great number of officers, of whom only four or five were opposed to the system of purchase, the Commission recommended that purchase should be allowed to remain as it was, with this single exception, 'that hereafter the Lieutenant-Colonelcy of a regiment should no longer be purchaseable, but should be an appointment made by the selection of the Commander-in-Chief from all the majors in that branch of the service.'

It may be observed, *en passant*, that this recommendation as to the selection of Lieutenant-Colonels of regiments was made directly in the teeth of the evidence of the Commander-in-Chief, who declared to the Commission that such selection was simply impossible! It would also be very prejudicial to promotion, inasmuch as it would necessarily prevent a Lieutenant-Colonel from making any 'arrangement' with his successor, as that successor would be unknown to him. It would therefore act as a drawback to his selling out.

Now, if the evidence of those few officers who were opposed to the system of purchase be examined, it will be found that their objections were of a vague and general character; somewhat of the nature which Mr. Gladstone characterises as 'an abstract motion.' They say the practice is derogatory to the profession; that it has an injurious effect upon all officers of the service; that it leads to a sordid and degrading traffic in commissions in the higher grades; that it prevents parents from giving their sons a good education; that it damps the ardour of officers; that it encourages

encourages idleness, and so forth. But when pressed a little closely by some practical members of the Commission who were not satisfied with such general assertions, not one of these witnesses ventured to affirm that the non-purchasing officer was a better soldier, or better educated, or more zealous, or more efficient, or in any single particular more fitted for the service than the purchasing officer; nor could any one of them suggest an effective machinery for maintaining the current of promotion in the event of purchase being abolished.

'But,' it may be said, 'these officers had probably all profited by the system—had purchased themselves on in their profession; but what does the unfortunate non-purchasing officer say? the man who is doomed to see his richer comrades pass over his head, not once but a dozen times! Let us hear what his view is.' So be it. Here is the evidence of Captain McPherson, a non-purchasing officer, as recorded at page 232 of the 'Proceedings of the Commission of 1856':—

'*Question.*—From your experience in that regiment, what is your opinion of the purchase system?

'*Answer.*—My opinion is, that it is highly beneficial to the service, as it accelerates promotion to the officers who do not purchase as well as to those who do. The officer who cannot purchase runs with the tide to the top of the list of his rank, and is there ready to take advantage of a death vacancy or the retirement of an officer on full pay; and I have known several instances in my own regiment, where officers not for purchase have reached the top of the Lieutenants in from five to seven years.'

Again he says:—

'In my whole 21 years' service only five deaths occurred in the regiment, therefore if promotion depended entirely upon death vacancies, an officer would not get his company in less than 25 years; but in consequence of the system of purchase he runs to the top in a short time, and is ready to take advantage of the few opportunities that occur.'

The officer who thus speaks in favour of purchase was purchased over eighteen times by his juniors!

No doubt occasional cases of individual hardship arise under the purchase system, such as that of Lieutenant-Colonel Cuddy, which was brought before the Commission of 1856 by Sir Colin Campbell; but as a general rule the non-purchasing officers do not complain. They know what they have to expect before they decide upon entering the service; and upon the whole they find themselves benefited by the system.

Here, then, we have successive Royal Commissions, after taking voluminous evidence on both sides of the question, reporting in favour

favour of purchase. We find almost all the officers who were examined to be in favour of purchase; we even find that the officers who cannot purchase are in favour of it; and we see that the few who object to the system have rather vague, general, and abstract ideas on the subject, and are utterly unprepared with any substitute for it! The question then naturally arises, what is the cause of this marvellous unanimity of opinion on the part of those who are most interested in the matter? And can a system be radically bad which is so universally approved of by them?

The fact is that the officers of the army know right well that if purchase be abolished, one of two methods must in future govern promotion—either that of selection or that of seniority; and that in either case promotion must be disastrously slow. They know, from the experience of other services, that no arrangements that the State can devise will be practically so satisfactory or so impartial as the system of purchase; and therefore they are willing to lend their money for a time, or even to pay it away altogether for the purpose of gaining rapid promotion, and with it all the chances of honours and rewards attending on high military rank, rather than linger for years in a subordinate position without prospects, without hope, and consequently without interest in their work.

Before, then, this system which is so generally satisfactory to the army, and the practical working of which has been declared by successive Royal Commissions to have been so beneficial, shall be abolished, its opponents are bound to provide some means by which the stream of promotion shall continue at the same rate as under the purchase system. This they propose to do by a system of liberal voluntary and compulsory retiring pensions, combined with selection for merit. No detailed plan has yet been put forth which holds out a fair prospect of success for this scheme. On the contrary, so far as our experience goes, we know that the plan of full-pay retirements has hitherto failed in the Ordnance corps, and that the consequence is, that the prospect as regards promotion in those corps is so unsatisfactory as to be the cause of serious embarrassment and anxiety to the Government.

The only way in which the stream of promotion could be maintained under a non-purchase system at the same rate as under the purchase system, is evidently by the annual expenditure by the State, in some shape or other, of a sum equal in amount to the value of the annual sale of commissions under the existing system. This Sir C. Trevelyan states to have been, previous to the Crimean War, at the rate of 753,000*l.* per annum. In addition

addition to this annual outlay in retiring pensions, the Government would be obliged to undertake the responsibility of paying to all officers, who should desire to sell, the value of their present commissions. This Sir C. Trevelyan estimates at 7,000,000*l.* sterling; so that in a financial view, the abolition of purchase would entail an enormous expense upon the public. Is the British taxpayer disposed to pay such a price for an *idea?* for as such we must consider the crusade against purchase in the army.

Nor would this even represent the whole expense of the measure of abolition. If the army is to be made a profession to which the poor man may look as a means of livelihood, the pay of the subalterns must be considerably increased. The officers who gave evidence before the Commission of 1856 declared that a subaltern could not live upon much less than 100*l.* a year besides his pay. Again we ask, is the British public disposed to incur this expense?

If so, well and good; our officers would doubtless be glad enough to save their money, and secure rapid promotion and better pay also. But the *idea* is ridiculous. No sane nation would undertake such an annual outlay without great and unavoidable necessity; the only alternative, therefore, is rapid promotion by purchase, or stagnant promotion without purchase. Does the country prefer that its officers should obtain their companies by purchase after an average of ten years' service, or without purchase after twenty-five years (as stated by Captain M'Pherson)?

'Oh! but,' says the opponent of purchase, 'we shall select the best officers for promotion, and thus put them over the heads of the idle or inefficient, and bring them on quickly.' Will you? and how are you to select the best officers? In war it can be done, to a certain extent, because opportunities arise of gaining distinction; but in war, promotion takes care of itself; it is rapid enough, without purchase, or selection, or any kind of fostering care. But in peace, selection is simply impossible! Who is to select? the commanding officer of a regiment naturally! How is he to select? What a difficult and invidious task would be his! One man may be a good disciplinarian, another a good drill; a third may be a scientific and studious officer; a fourth may be of robust body, with natural powers of command; in short, there is no limit to the various qualities which officers may possess; and the consequence would be that the commanding officer would get rid of the difficulty of selection by simply recommending the senior officer for promotion. The same course would be pursued by general officers; and even by

by the Commander-in-Chief, when selecting Lieutenant-Colonels of battalions from among the Majors. Indeed, his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge distinctly told the Commissioners of 1856 that the power of selection would be impossible.

The system of selection would never be popular in our army. Regulate it as you will, put whatever checks you may upon it, there would always be great danger of its becoming a mere system of favouritism; and the authorities who were charged with the selection would always be exposed to improper influence of all sorts, and would be subject to every kind of suspicion and reflection on their motives and actions.

Selection could never govern promotion in time of peace; therefore, whatever theorists may say to the contrary, seniority *pur et simple* will be the only substitute for purchase; and a system of promotion by seniority means this—old officers, stagnation, indifference, want of hope and consequently of zeal, lifelessness, till at last the officer dwindles out his wretched existence in the uninteresting routine of 'going to parade,' 'going to mess,' 'going to bed!'

But there is still another phase of this question. Suppose purchase to be nominally abolished. Do the army reformers imagine that it can be so in reality? If so, they are very much mistaken; all experience, both past and present, proves the contrary. If purchase be not openly permitted, it is certain to be practised in secret. Formerly there was a very strict prohibition against an officer paying more than the regulated price for his steps, and he had to sign a stringent certificate that he had not done so. Yet the rule was evaded as a matter of course, and the authorities seeing that it was of no effect in stopping the practice, while it tended to inculcate loose ideas of honour and morality, very wisely dispensed with the certificate, though still nominally prohibiting the practice of paying more than the regulated sum for commissions.

So in the Indian army, there was no recognised purchase; yet a complete system of compulsory contribution towards steps was in course of time introduced (a system which, in our opinion, was far more oppressive to the poor officer than the British system) and became so general, that the Indian Government was at last obliged to sanction it!

Again, in the Volunteer army, there is a most stringent prohibition against the sale of Adjutancies; and the system of certificates on honour, long since abandoned in the regular army as inefficacious, is in full force with them. Yet it is well known that an Adjutancy of Volunteers fetches a large price, and that it is almost impossible to obtain one without payment.

The

The case of full-pay retirements, mentioned at page 41 of Sir Charles Trevelyan's pamphlet, is another proof of our assertion. It certainly was not contemplated that these retirements would be made the subject of barter and sale; yet such was the case. The retiring officer immediately bargained for a certain sum (generally amounting to the regulation-price of his commission) before he sent in his application to retire on full pay.

Sir Charles Trevelyan indeed tells us at page 42 of his pamphlet that the Lords of the Treasury on one occasion withheld from the officers of the army certain proposed advantages, not in themselves objectionable, because they had no assurance that the boon would not be neutralised by an increased price of commissions. With all deference to their Lordships, we cannot help remarking that they seem in this instance to have acted with much injustice in thus denying to the officers a proffered boon merely because it militated against some crotchety preconceived idea of theirs regarding purchase in the army!

The example of the Artillery and Engineers, the Navy, and the Civil Service, quoted by Sir Charles Trevelyan as services in which purchase does not exist either directly or indirectly, cannot be considered as conclusive against the view here taken, and which is based upon the general experience of the army. The circumstances of those services are not similar. In the Navy and the Civil Service buying and selling are obviously impossible; while in the Ordnance corps the officers are so scattered that it would be difficult for them to come to any agreement with one another as to the sale of their commissions. But where thirty or forty officers are constantly living together, meeting daily and hourly—at parade, at mess, and on fifty occasions—there is every facility and inducement to come to an arrangement with each other; and if the rumoured plan of forming the Artillery into several separate regiments be effected, and the promotion be made regimental instead of general, we shall be much surprised if some system of secret purchase in the shape of bonuses on retirement be not introduced into that branch of the service.

It may therefore be assumed that purchase cannot be really abolished: that it will continue to exist in some shape or other; and that after the State shall have gone to a heavy expense in abolishing it nominally, it will in reality continue to flourish as vigorously as ever!

Without entering further into the subject, or considering the other numerous matters of detail discussed by Sir C. Trevelyan, such as 'Military Education,' 'Staff Corps,' 'Military Colleges,' 'Military Allowances,' 'Pay of Generals,' 'Colonelcies of Regiments,'

Regiments,' 'Regimental Agencies,' 'Half-pay,' &c., all which measures be they good or be they bad are in no wise dependent upon the question of purchase, we may conclude by thus shortly summing up our reasons for dissenting from the proposal to abolish purchase in the army.

We dissent, then—

1. Because it would lead to a system of promotion by seniority, which must inevitably be disastrously slow, and would produce old, inefficient officers instead of young, capable, and zealous ones.

2. Because it would discourage men of family and high lineage from entering the service, and would thus lower the position of the officers in society.

3. Because the system of selection which is proposed to be substituted is inapplicable, and would lead to suspicion of favouritism, and to consequent discontent.

4. Because no efficient substitute for purchase can be devised, either as regards promotion or strict impartiality.

5. Because under the purchase system the British officer is equal, if not superior, to any class of officer in other services.

And finally, Because it is impossible to abolish purchase in reality, even if it be so in name; and it is therefore unnecessary for the State to waste its money in the attempt.

We therefore trust that Parliament will hesitate before taking the decided step of passing a measure by which our officers shall be condemned to linger for years in the subordinate ranks without prospect of promotion; by which young men of high and noble families shall be discouraged from entering the service; and by which the condition of the officers of the army will be lowered and deteriorated. We earnestly hope that our legislators will, in the approaching debate, listen to the experience of military men rather than to the visions of theorists; and that no 'leap in the dark' may be taken in a matter which may have a more important effect upon the future of England than is perhaps dreamt of in their philosophy.

ART. X.—1. *Case of the Established Church in Ireland.* By James Thomas, Bishop of Ossory. London, 1867.

2. *Letter on the Disendowment of the Established Ch*
the Right Rev. David Moriarty, Bishop of
1867.

3. *Letter to the Right Hon. Chichester*
Ireland. By John Earl Russell.

4. *Fallacies and Fictions relating to the Irish Church Establishment exposed.* By Arthur Edward Gayer, Q.C., one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland. Third edition. Dublin, 1868.
5. *Lord Dufferin and the Irish Church.* By Capt. F. Petrie. London, 1868.
6. *Ireland: a Letter to Earl Grey.* By Archbishop Manning. London, 1868.
7. *Letter to John Bright, Esq., M.P., respecting the Irish Church.* By Henry Earl Grey. London, 1868.

WE make no apology for returning to the question, What shall we do for Ireland? which has lost none of its interest since we discussed it in our last number. The general anxiety felt about the state of Ireland has called forth a number of discordant suggestions, enough to remind one of such a consultation of physicians as Molière has described. Every one has a different account to give of the disease, a different remedy to propose, and each can name some Lord Aldborough who has taken his remedy with success. There are some in Ireland who cry out for republican institutions as the only cure for her troubles. Look at America, they say, and see how Irishmen prosper there, and doubt not they would thrive as well at home if the form of government were the same. Others declare that the remedy consists in peasant proprietorship and small holdings. Look at the prosperity of Belgium, and judge what the Belgians would make of Ireland if they were allowed to manage it as they do their own country. Nay, say others, Popery is the curse of Ireland: see how Protestant Ulster flourishes, how free it is from agitation and discontent, and be sure that the south and west of the island would prosper like the north and east if only the religion were the same. The course of recent proceedings in Parliament has simplified the discussion of these theories, and only makes it necessary that we should consider whether the true account of the matter is that the existence of the Established Church is a principal cause of Irish discontent, and its removal a necessary condition of peace and prosperity in Ireland. It is an advantage that the question should be simplified; but it is not so that a subject which especially needs to be considered calmly and with sobriety of judgment should be made the battle-ground of party, and chosen as an engine for displacing a Ministry. In a contest by the bedside of a frighted patient the quack has an advantage over the regular physician. A man who has been thoroughly alarmed abo his own health or that of some beloved relative likes to be to

some nostrum which will give immediate relief, and in his frantic eagerness to do something thinks it very unsatisfactory to hear that nothing can be done but assist nature, and wait patiently until the disease has run its course. One who gives this opinion may easily be accused of not appreciating the gravity of the disease, and such has been the fate that has befallen the Government, who have been treated as having proved their incompetency to deal with the question of Ireland because they did not come down to Parliament at the beginning of the session to propose some violent organic changes. Indeed, the moderation of the suggestions made in our last number has brought a similar accusation upon ourselves, and Cardinal Cullen, in a pastoral, has charged us with wishing to add despair to the other miseries of Ireland. It is not very fair to represent a physician as indifferent to the health of his patient because he objects to measures which in his judgment are likely to work more mischief than the disease they are intended to cure.

When the welfare of so large a part of the empire is at stake we think it not too much to call on thoughtful men of all politics to rise above party considerations, and to endeavour calmly to appreciate the evil to be dealt with and its remedies. For ourselves we can honestly say that we are anxious to divest ourselves of prejudice, and not to reject any measure which can be shown to be for the interest of Ireland, however distasteful it may be to our own feelings. On the other hand, we must repeat our conviction of the harm done by exaggerated descriptions of Irish sufferings and Irish discontent, the object of which is to induce us to legislate in a panic, and thus perhaps exasperate and perpetuate the evils of which we complain.

There are some points on which we think impartial men of all parties will agree. First, the statistics produced by Lord Mayo in the first Irish debate clearly show that, however unsatisfactory in some respects the condition of the country may be, there are causes in operation which have already done much for the material prosperity of Ireland, and which, if not interfered with, will do more. Ever since the famine of 1847 the general state of the country has been one of continued improvement. The rate of wages has risen, and the comforts of the labouring classes, though still below the English standard, have been steadily increasing. Agrarian outrages, so long the chronic disorder of Ireland, have almost entirely disappeared. The total acreage under cultivation has risen; the amount of live stock more than doubled; the tonnage of vessels entering and clearing out from the principal ports also doubled; the value of the exports largely increased; the consumption of duty-paying articles

ticles also increased. Rents were never better paid than at this moment; and the chief hindrance now to the material prosperity of Ireland is the shock to confidence which the Fenian agitation itself has produced, and which has checked the investment of capital in the country. Against these symptoms of prosperity must be set the grave fact that the Habeas Corpus Act has remained suspended for the last two years, a necessity which every one must deplore. Yet an Englishman may feel some pride in contrasting the amount of liberty which is enjoyed in foreign countries with that which remains in Ireland, when the main guarantee of personal liberty has been removed. With us public opinion is a safeguard for liberty not less effectual than law. We can scarcely give the Government much credit for the forbearance with which they have used the extraordinary power entrusted to them; for the weapon they have wielded would have broken in their hands on the first attempt to misapply it. We know no country in Europe where the operation of the ordinary laws would permit so much to be written and said, calculated to excite contempt and hatred against the Government, as has been written and said in Ireland by men whom the Lord Lieutenant had the power of sending to prison without assigning a reason. When the license thus granted appeared to be grossly abused, juries were called on to decide whether the ordinary laws against sedition had not been violated; but the extraordinary powers vested in the Government were strictly reserved for the suppression of attempts intended to break up the whole framework of society. It was in the full confidence that only this use would be made of them, that these powers were granted. It must be remembered then that the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act is not a restriction imposed by England upon Ireland, but a measure passed by an overwhelming majority of the Irish representatives, giving to a Government composed entirely of Irishmen power more effectually to protect the lives and property of peaceable Irishmen against plots concocted in a foreign country.

The Fenian agitation is of indisputably foreign origin, and would expire if not sustained by American emissaries. It can hardly be said that blisters on a man's skin are a proof of internal disease, if we know that he has been whipped with nettles. The Fenian insurrection has found its men in the disbanded soldiers of the American Civil War, who during their military service had lost their taste for the occupations of peace, and it has der
its money extensively from Americans in a state of high
against England, which was considered to have
refused to sympathise with the North du

struggle. In Ireland this movement has not, like former rebellious movements, found any native leaders of character, position, or intelligence. Every one who had anything to lose shrank from rebellion against England. Although the laws respecting land were said to be answerable for much of existing discontent, comparatively few of the cultivators of the land have been found in the Fenian ranks. A large proportion of those who were apprehended after the abortive rising of Shrove Tuesday, last year, were found to consist of shopboys, or even of the *gamins* who hang about the Dublin streets. The force that has kept Fenianism down, the Royal Irish constabulary, is completely national and popular. How very little Irish discontent has had a domestic origin is proved by the fact that the most thoroughly Irish districts of the country have been the quietest. At the time of the conquest by Cromwell, the project was entertained of driving the conquered race into the west of the island, and hell or Connaught is said to have been the choice that was offered to the Papists. If those are right who trace Irish discontent to the rankling memory of injuries inflicted by England in former days, Connaught is the place which ought to be the head-quarters of sedition; and since there are some who ascribe great part of Irish evils to the bitterness of religious dissension, it may be added that Connaught has been the main theatre of the operations of the Irish Church Mission Society for the conversion of Roman Catholics. Yet Protestant Ulster has scarcely been so free from Fenianism as Catholic Connaught. At the recent meeting of the Midland Railway Company, the Chairman told his shareholders that their line had not, like others, suffered loss of traffic from the Fenian conspiracy. He says, 'It would be ungenerous on my part towards the inhabitants of the district through which our line runs, if I did not tell you that they are to a great extent free from its baneful influence. In the province of Connaught, which we lay claim to as ours, there is as loyal and as law-loving a people as there is in any part of Her Majesty's dominions.' Similar testimony was borne by Judge Keogh in his charges on his last circuit in that province.

If it must be owned on the one hand that the origin of the Fenian poison is foreign, it must be owned on the other that it could not have *taken* as it has if all had been perfectly healthy at home. Sympathy with Fenians is felt in Ireland by many who have no wish that their projects should succeed. We do not speak merely of those who are glad of the Fenian agitation

look on it as a political engine, and expect that the

will extort changes of the law which they

who wish for more favourable arrange-

ments

ments with their landlords, Roman Catholic clergymen who desire more complete control of education and more political influence. Such men's condemnation of Fenianism will no doubt want that heartiness of moral indignation which Englishmen expect to find in it.* But besides, to many Irishmen wholly averse to rebellion, the Fenian leaders seem at worst mistaken patriots, ready to give their lives for their country, deserving of respectful sympathy, not of punishment. We are forced to ask ourselves why do not insurrectionary attempts meet with the same general condemnation in Ireland as in England or Scotland, and if there are causes of discontent peculiar to Ireland should they not be grappled with and removed?

But we may fairly ask that we shall not be called on to do impossibilities. When we strive to learn from Irish agitators what the causes of discontent are, we commonly find that great part of their declamations is taken up with instances of injustice practised by England towards Ireland in former days. If the laws of which they complain have been long since repealed we can do no more. We cannot, as it has been said, legislate for our great grandfathers. Neither again can we re-open many questions which our great grandfathers have settled rightly or wrongly. If any one could prove to us that his ancestors had lost their lands unjustly in the confiscations of Cromwell, we could not restore them without worse injustice.

Once more, to come to what more than anything else we believe to be the cause of present discontent in Ireland, we cannot make its physical conditions the same as those of America; we cannot by any legislation make land as cheap or wages as high in Ireland as in America. At the time of the Irish famine it was generally recognised that one great cause of the misery of Ireland was over population, from which resulted a fierce competition among the applicants for labour, and a consequent undue depression of wages. The obvious remedy for this evil was emigration; and the great spread of education in Ireland had removed the obstacles which formerly prevented this remedy from being resorted to. America was no longer an unknown land. The people had abundant information from books and letters how to get there, and what advantages they would gain by removing. They were invited to leave a country where wages were less than a shilling a day, and where the purchase of land was a luxury wholly beyond the peasant's reach, and betake themselves to a country where a day's labour would earn two or three dollars,

* Cardinal Cullen in several pastorals condemns the Fenian organisation; the kind of blame which he imputes to it may be judged of from his bracketing together the Fenians, Freemasons, and other secret societies

and where one dollar would suffice to purchase the fee-simple of an acre of land (Maguire's 'America,' p. 237). They received letters from friends who had tried the experiment with success, and who instead of struggling with poverty in Ireland were well-to-do proprietors in America. Thus immense numbers were induced to emigrate, and their departure has had a perceptible effect in increasing the remuneration given to the labour of those who have remained behind. Yet, however beneficial this great migration has been, both to those who went and to those who have remained, it has inevitably produced a certain irritation of feeling against England. Voluntary emigration cannot take place unless men are convinced that they will be considerably better off in another country than in their own, and discontent must follow from the general spread of such a conviction in a country where men are accustomed to look to the Government for help on all occasions, and conversely to blame the Government when things go wrong.*

Numberless declamations have been founded on the text that a couple of millions of Irishmen have been forced to leave the homes of their youth and the graves of their fathers;† that England starved them and turned them out, America welcomed them in and fed them. English laws and English rule bear the blame of the misery suffered by an overcrowded people, and American institutions gain the credit of what is really due to the different physical circumstances of a country where there is a boundless supply of land and a comparatively scanty population. There is scarcely a Fenian speech in America, or an article on Ireland in foreign periodicals, where this wholesale deportation of Irishmen does not figure prominently in the list of wrongs inflicted by England upon Ireland. Yet if the truth is that no legislation could have made it possible for eight millions of people to live comfortably in Ireland, England, by facilitating the removal of

* The late American Minister Mr. Adams takes the same view as we do with regard to the connexion between emigration and Irish discontent. He says, 'One effect of this form of emigration is to leave in the midst of the community a great and festering sore of discontent. Hearing the most exciting accounts of the prospects held forth to them in America, and powerless to cross the gulf that separates them from it, the tendency is to repine at their fate, and to lay the blame of it somewhere. Very naturally the Government comes in as the great object.'

† Take as a specimen Cardinal Cullen's pastoral, Jan. 1868:—'The country has lost more than 3,000,000 inhabitants, who have been obliged to brave the dangers of the wide Atlantic in order to save themselves and families from starvation. About 400,000 cottages of the poor have been levelled to the ground lest they shou[illegible] [illegible]er to their former inmates. Many villages have [illegible] [illegible]al towns once busy and prosperous are

the

taries,* would overpower any resistance which the defenders of the English Church Establishment could offer. Accordingly it was by English Dissenters—Mr. Dillwyn and Mr. Miall—that the subject of the Irish Church was brought before the House of Commons; while there was but a feeble echo in Ireland to assaults made either by religious men who hold that all Church endowment is wrong—a principle utterly denied by all Roman Catholics; or by irreligious men anxious to undermine the strength given by State support to a system which they believe to be false and superstitious.

It is not a little remarkable how the combination of Nonconformists and Philosophers, though numerically weak, has succeeded in advancing a proposal, three years ago regarded as impracticable, to a position in popular favour such as to admit of its being made the battle cry of a great party. The means used were partly persistent misrepresentations, of which we shall say something presently, but chiefly a dexterous advantage taken of the panic excited by such Fenian outrages as the attempt on Chester Castle, the Manchester rescue, the Clerkenwell explosion. In all times of public panic an ominous cry of Whom shall we hang? is apt to make itself heard; and on such occasions, provided a victim be offered them, the clamourers are easily satisfied without any close examination as to his guilt. Most persons have read of the atrocities committed by panic-stricken multitudes, under the impression that the plague had been artificially introduced or propagated among them, and of the use made of their terror by unscrupulous men, who consigned personal enemies to death by raising against them the cry that they were well-poisoners, or *untori*. Such precisely has been the course taken by the enemies of the Irish Church Establishment. Nothing can be more certain than that that Establishment is perfectly innocent of the origin or growth of Fenianism. The Fenian leaders have laid bare with perfect candour their motives and their aims; and their movement presents itself as purely socialistic, not religious. With their success no doubt the Church Establishment would share the fate of other English institutions, and rent and rent-charge would perish together; but still of hostility to the Irish Church, as such, there has been no trace. It has been shown by one of themselves in a remarkable paper in 'Tinsley's Magazine,' that the object aimed at is nothing less than the disruption of the English empire. The

* The 'Spectator' reckons that the lowering of the county franchise will add greatly to the Nonconformist interest in the counties.

question

question of the Irish Church Establishment apparently never once presented itself to the minds of the Fenian leaders, and they profess that if it were destroyed to-morrow they would not the less continue their efforts. But innocence is a poor protection to a victim in time of panic. The cry has been raised that this is the institution the abolition of which will appease Irish discontent; and many a helpless politician, ignorant what other solution of the Irish problem to propose, adopts this one without enquiring whether it would really effect what is promised, or whether it would not rather destroy all hopes for the intellectual and spiritual freedom of Ireland, and alienate every friend England has in Ireland without conciliating a single enemy.

It needs not to be said that the English voluntaries could not have availed themselves of the Fenian panic to help their crusade against establishments if they had not succeeded in gaining the partial support of the Irish Roman Catholics. Misgivings, indeed, seized some of the more sagacious of the Irish Roman Catholics as to the danger of accepting the alliance that was offered them. Bishop Moriarty (one of that fair and liberal-minded section which is unhappily in a minority in the Roman Catholic priesthood, and perhaps its only representative in the prelacy) asks the question, 'May we not reasonably fear that at no very distant time we might ourselves become the objects of a spoliation based on the same principles?' 'The Catholic Church in this country has not acquired or accumulated property since the great spoliation. We must expect, however, that the action of charity and religious feeling will gradually create endowments to some extent, especially for conventual and charitable institutions. Suppose that the State following the example of the Catholic governments of Europe, and using for a precedent the spoliation of the Established Church which we demand, should secularize such property, or should assume the administration of it, the proceeding might seem to many completely to accord with the principles and policy now suggested.' 'The spirit of the world is against endowment. Our poverty has alone protected us from the world's hostility.' In these extracts the Bishop is so prudent as to speak of it only as a thing in the possible future that his Church might be in the possession of property worth robbing. But every one acquainted with Ireland knows that it is a thing of the actual present. It is an anachronism to speak of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland as a poor Church. We have something to say presently of the revenues which she receives from the contributions of her living members. But we must say a little now of what she is continually amassing from the

the gifts of the dying. The English Church in her service for the visitation of the sick, directs the minister not to omit earnestly to move such sick persons as are of ability to be liberal to the poor. It is not to be supposed that the Roman Catholic clergy neglect the like exhortations in similar circumstances, and these exhortations are the more effectual as addressed to men who believe in purgatory, and who are persuaded that the wealth of this world may be so applied as to abridge their sufferings in the next. Since the changes in the constitution of the Probate Court which give publicity to its proceedings, Protestants have seen in the newspapers so many reports of trials of wills disputed which had been made under the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy, that they have been forced to ask themselves what amount of money is bequeathed for Roman Catholic religious purposes of which the public hear nothing—because the relations are either unwilling or unable to contest the validity of the wills, or because suits are compromised in order to avoid exposure. No one can move about Ireland without seeing everywhere signs of Roman Catholic wealth; on every road round the great cities Roman Catholic institutions are springing up; and when a gentleman's seat comes into the market, it is constantly found to have met with ecclesiastical purchasers. From the nature of the case, ecclesiastical property never can be diminished, and is in a constant state of increase, so that Bishop Moriarty is not without ground for his fears that the time will come when the property of his Church in Ireland will be enough to tempt spoliation such as it has undergone in all the Roman Catholic countries in Europe—in France, in Spain, in Italy. When that danger arises, there can be no doubt that the Roman Catholic Church will have most to dread from the 'philosophers' who now offer themselves as her allies in the assault on the Protestant Establishment. That school of politicians does not recognise the peculiar sacredness of ecclesiastical property, nor does it admit that an individual has any right to dictate how his property is to be disposed of *in secula seculorum.* It thinks it quite enough if a man is allowed to enjoy his wealth during his lifetime: and if in concession to popular prejudices it acquiesces in his disposal of it for charitable uses after his death, it claims for the State a right to step in after a reasonable time, and apply the money as the public expediency may require.

Mr. Aubrey de Vere has taken a leading part in pointing out to his co-religionists the dangers they run in joining the cry for the secularisation of Church property. In one of his letters he estimates

estimates, on the authority of Major O'Reilly, the sums expended by the Irish Roman Catholics since 1800 on churches, convents, &c., as over five millions and a quarter. He points out that these acquisitions rest not on the general laws of property, but on the Charitable Bequests Act; and he asks how those who consent to the secularising of Church property twelve centuries old, can consistently object to interference with the provisions of an Act made a few years ago. He tells them that it will be said to them, 'You were poor, and it was but just to trust you with some property to balance the ample endowments of the Protestant body; but you have now acquired a larger property than was intended, and the old endowments have been secularised at your urgency.' It is plain then that Roman Catholic ecclesiastics run a grave risk in allying themselves with men who hold principles so much at variance with their own, and will be wise to be cautious lest they establish in the case of the Protestant Church precedents which may hereafter be used against themselves.

Another consideration Bishop Moriarty has not overlooked, namely, the common danger with which the progress of infidelity threatens all who hold the Christian faith. He acknowledges the services rendered by the Established Church in former days, in repelling the infidelity of the Voltairian school; and he owns of what important advantage it has been that in all the controversies which have raged in Ireland, the inspiration of the Written Word, and the Godhead of our blessed Saviour, have been principles assumed and supposed by the combatants on both sides. He perceives the danger that the sweeping away of the Established Church might be the removal of a great breakwater against infidelity, and he is not blind to the impolicy of an alliance with infidels by one denomination of Christians in order to overthrow another.

The apprehensions which have suggested themselves to Bishop Moriarty, whose weight unfortunately in the councils of his Church is not great, do not seem to occur to Cardinal Cullen. He has no scruple in accepting the aid of the enemies of all endowments in order to humiliate and depress a rival communion. He knows that in those parts of the country where Protestants are scattered at a distance from each other over a wide area, their spiritual wants cannot be provided for on the voluntary system. He foresees a great triumph for his Church if the Establishment were destroyed, when these scattered Protestants must either emigrate, or else sinking into irreligion and carelessness of the distinctions between one form of religion and another, be reduced by the silent operation of intermarriages

marriages to conformity with the prevalent religion. The Church of Rome in Ireland has found that she has nothing to dread from the dissenting sects, whose energies are expended in making converts from the Church; and it is by the latter that all attempts for the conversion of Roman Catholics have been made. Consequently it is against the Establishment that the odium theologicum most flourishes, and Cardinal Cullen does not scruple to propose that her clergy should be despoiled of her property, while comparatively indifferent what becomes of the money taken from them.* A man places himself in no amiable light when he desires that his neighbours should be injured when he has not even the excuse of hoping himself to profit by their loss. Yet there are very good reasons why the Roman Catholic clergy should not desire to take the place from which they ask their rivals to be expelled. One reason is the danger of State interference with Church rule. The Roman Catholic Church would not tolerate that a clergyman deposed by his bishop should claim his benefice as his freehold, and invoke the authority of lay courts to examine whether there were any good reasons why he should be deprived of it. This objection, however, might be removed, and means might be devised by which the Roman Catholic Church might receive from the State funds sufficient for the payment of her clergy, with as little sacrifice of her independence as she at present receives 30,000*l.* a year for Maynooth. But the great objection is, that if the whole ecclesiastical funds of Ireland were handed over to the Roman Catholic priests, they would be worse off than they are at present. There are, as might be expected, more Roman Catholic than Protestant clergy, but each of the former, though a single man, receives on an average at least as large an ecclesiastical income as that on which one of the latter tries to maintain a wife and family. Statistics as to the income of the Roman Catholic clergy are of course not to be had; but since the proposal in our last number that State pay should be substituted for the voluntary contributions of the people, Roman Catholic authorities estimate the latter at an amount of which we had never heard before. Mr. Bruen, in the late debate, cites the 'Freeman's Journal' as estimating them at 762,000*l.* a year, a sum not much less than double the amount of the tithe rent-charge. Lord Russell, on the authority of a Roman Catholic bishop, who is most probably Bishop Moriarty, gives the income of a Roman Catholic parish priest as 200*l.*, and that of a curate

* His proposal to take funds destined for pious uses and give them to the poor may be said to have been extinguished by the precedent found for it by the Saturday Review.'

100*l.*

100*l.* a year. Some Roman Catholic rectors, he says, have 500*l.* a year. It is not stated whether this is inclusive or exclusive of marriage fees, which the same authority states amount sometimes to 15*l.* or 20*l.* Our own private information would lead us to believe these figures to be rather under than over stated. The income of a Protestant curate is now gradually rising from its legal 75*l.* to 100*l.* a year; the average income of all the incumbents in Ireland is about 260*l.* a year. It is evident then how the Roman Catholic clergy would lose if they were to give up what they at present enjoy for the revenues of the Established Church, which would of course yield a smaller dividend when divided among a greater number. Further, they would be placed under considerable disadvantage by the publicity given to the amount of the income of each. At present each Roman Catholic assesses himself, desiring not to deal more shabbily with his clergyman than his neighbour, but without any idea what may be the sum total of their joint contributions. It is quite possible that the same persons, if called on to judge what amount of annual income would enable a single gentleman to live in reasonable comfort, might name a lower sum than that enjoyed already.*

But it may be asked, if the voluntary system produces such splendid results in the case of the Roman Catholic clergy, why should the Protestants object to make trial of it, especially when they count in their body the richer and more educated classes of the community? But there are many reasons why the same experiment, if tried by Protestants, could not count on the same success. In the first place, the religious opinions common among Protestants place them less in the power of their clergy, and more independent of any influence the latter can bring to bear upon them. No Protestant, who is under the displeasure of his clergyman, feels as a Roman Catholic feels who has been denied the rites of his Church, and who regards his eternal salvation imperilled unless he can make his peace. But secondly, the Roman Catholic peasant pays his priest for political as well as religious services. He trusts him as a 'tribunus plebis,' who can powerfully invoke public sympathy for him, should he have any

* Bishop Moriarty, while refusing, as he has such good reason, to accept salaries given to the Roman Catholic clergy directly, would like to have public grants for the purchase of glebes and for the building of places of worship. Dean O'Brien is content to ask for the repeal of the Union. No doubt an Irish Parliam elected under the influence of the priests, would vote for their payme any purposes they had at heart, precisely whatever sums the The moderation of Dean O'Brien's proposal is therefore Gamp's 'Don't ask me whether I will take none or wh bottle on the chimney-piece, where I can help myself wh

grievance to complain of, and who can state his case in a manner which he is himself unable to do. Corresponding services the richer and better educated classes do not require. But the most important point is that one cannot expect to raise the same income for religious objects from a few rich persons that can be raised from a great number of moderate means. No railway company receives nearly the same amount of income from first-class passengers as it receives from second and third. Every one connected with charitable societies knows that it is the greatest delusion in the world to expect that if A gives a guinea, B, whose income is ten times as great, will give ten guineas. The Roman Catholic clergyman is sure of his income, because he draws it from a great many; the Protestant country clergyman would be dependent on the piety of comparatively a few. Take the common case of a large proprietor whose rent-charge at present pays the income of his rector, and suppose the State were to divert this money to other purposes, would he put his hand in his pocket for as much more to pay the services of a chaplain for himself and his poor Protestant neighbours? Several, no doubt, would consent to make a sacrifice, in proportion to their means, probably not greater than that made by the Roman Catholic tenants for the maintenance of their pastor. Others would migrate to towns, or to England, where they might enjoy spiritual consolation on cheaper terms, and would leave their Protestant tenants to their fate. Others, indifferent to religion, would dispense with the luxury altogether. On the whole it seems essential to the success of the voluntary system that it should draw its resources from a considerable number of contributors; and the Protestants of Ireland may be excused from distrusting a system which would no doubt sufficiently provide for cities and other places where they are massed in large numbers, but which would altogether deprive of religious teaching those sparsely scattered over a large country.

But, indeed, to attempt to console the members of the Established Church for the loss of their endowments by dwelling on the advantages of the voluntary system, is much the same as if one were to attempt to convince the heir to an estate that it would be no hardship to be deprived of it, by pointing to the number of persons who succeed in earning a much larger income, though starting without a penny in their pockets. The members of the Established Church regard its endowments as their inherited possession secured to them by long prescription, and by every sanction the Legislature could give, which on this subject at the times of passing both the Act of Union and the Emancipation Act, did all that in it lay to tie up its own hands and prevent

prevent this property being ever meddled with. They feel that to deprive them of property so secured would be to give a dangerous shock to the whole institution of property in the kingdom. Every Protestant purchaser of land in Ireland for the last three hundred years (and of the purchasers in the Incumbered Estates Court a vast majority were Protestants) has taken into account that he was settling in a place where provision had been made for his religious wants. And if that on which he reckoned when he made his purchase be taken from him, he must, unless he be a purchaser on so large a scale as to be rich enough to supply the deficiency out of his own means, either sell his land at a disadvantage, or swell the ranks of the absentees, or be content to bring up his family in a state of heathenism.

One of the commonest mistakes in dealing with the Church question is to treat it as if the ecclesiastical revenues of Ireland were connected with no past, and were a sum of money put into our hands now, for the first time, to lay out for the religious instruction of the people. The question is not whether the arrangement of ecclesiastical property that was made 300 years ago is that which we should make now. The question is, whether we can now, without injustice, disturb a settlement of property round which have grown all the rights and interests, and reasonable expectations, that accompany a possession of 300 years. Believing as we do that at the time of the Reformation there was much unjustifiable spoliation of Church property by laymen, we might, if continued possession were a thing to be disregarded, call on the present holders of this property to surrender what their ancestors had unjustly acquired. When this point was raised by Lord Derby, Lord Russell wholly failed to show why, on the principle on which he assailed the Irish Church, the Russell family should not be called on to surrender Woburn Abbey and Covent Garden. The claims put forward by the Roman Catholic priesthood affect one kind of property as much as the other. Bishop Moriarty tells us that 'the Roman Catholic Church is the rightful owner of all ecclesiastical property in this country, with the exception of what the Protestant Church has acquired since its separation.' 'We acknowledge no prescription in this case. The Church does not allow a statute of limitation to bar our claim.'* 'Our right is in abeyance, but it is unimpaired.'

* Our suspicion that Lord Russell has been much influenced by Bishop Moriarty is strengthened by finding that Lord Russell adopts this monstrous principle. He actually proposes that the fate of property given to the Irish Church by Protestants since the Reformation shall be determined by a Commission which shall inquire whether any of it had ever been held by the Church in pr

paired.' When a man on other subjects so sober and sensible as Bishop Moriarty puts forward, or thinks himself obliged to put forward, such nonsense as this, Irish peasants may be forgiven if, tracing their descent to some ancient kings, they 'acknowledge no prescription,' and hold 'that no statute of limitations can bar their claim' to the lands which their ancestors enjoyed. If Irishmen are to be taught that possession for 300 years counts for nothing, we must be prepared to discuss and satisfy the claims of those whose fathers lost their lands in the rebellions in Elizabeth's reign, or the confiscations of Cromwell.

The simple equity of the matter is that, in ecclesiastical affairs and secular alike, when an arrangement has existed for a long time things accommodate themselves to it, settlements of property are made on the faith of it, and a thousand interests grow up which cannot be disturbed without injustice. Take, for instance, the proposal made by Mr. Arnold in a letter to the 'Times' that in every parish the places of worship now used by members of the Established Church should be transferred to the religious denomination designated by a vote of two-thirds of the parishioners; the proposal might be fair if it related to houses newly built at State expense. But how would it actually work? Since of the gross population of Ireland more than two-thirds are Roman Catholics, the proposal means that as a general rule the places of worship now used by the Protestants should be taken from them and given to the Roman Catholics. But the latter are already long since provided with churches, so that the proposal means that instead of the people of each religion having a church to worship in, the Roman Catholics should have one more than they want and the Protestants none. And when it is further remembered that the places in question have been almost entirely built and repaired by Protestant money, it may easily be conceived what an amount of bad blood would be caused by what would be felt to be such gross injustice.* We hear a good

pre-Reformation times. He does not say whether the same principle is to be applied to the estates of Lord Clanricarde, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Gormanstown, and others, who hold their properties by exactly the same title as much of the Church property, namely, the Act of Settlement of 1662. It is remarkable that on this point Cardinal Cullen and his party hold less extravagant views than Bishop Moriarty. They maintain that the Roman Catholic Church has ceded its claims, and that the cession received the Pope's sanction in 1805 and 1810.

* Church-rates in Ireland were abolished in 1833, and the fund out of which churches have since been built and repaired consists of the revenues of the suppressed bishoprics, together with a tax levied on the Protestant incumbents. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, however, finding the funds at their disposal insufficient for the purposes desired to be accomplished, have seen it necessary to economise them by making their grants as far as possible only in aid of local contributions.

good deal of the revengeful feelings caused by evictions of tenants dispossessed of holdings which their fathers had enjoyed for years, and on which they had largely laid out money. What end would there be to the angry passions raised by a gigantic eviction of Protestants from the houses which their money had reared, and the places where their fathers had been wont to worship, merely to give a triumph to rivals who themselves would have no use for what would be handed over to them?

In the case of church fabrics every one can see that regard must be paid to use and possession, and that we cannot proceed according to the same rules on which we might act were the people of Ireland without any places of worship, and were the State now first to make a grant of buildings for their use. But the same principles exactly apply to Church endowments. The Roman Catholics have already provided for themselves funds for the payment of their priests, and have declared that they do not want the revenues of the Establishment, and prefer not to have them. On the other hand everything that private liberality among Churchmen has done since the Reformation has been mixed up with the ancient possessions of the Church: lay impropriations have been bought up, or have been given back to the Church. Primate Boulter's fund is an example of what has been done in this way. All the glebe lands of the North of Ireland are acquisitions made since the Reformation. It is easy to give proof how wretchedly poor in the times of Jeremy Taylor and Archbishop Bramhall was that part of ecclesiastical property which is now the wealthiest. The Church of Ireland would not start fair with other religious bodies if it were now turned out of its possessions. It would be the only religious body in the country without private endowments. It would lose all that its pious

---

contributions. Every one connected with Ireland knows how many circulars come to him soliciting help for church-building purposes. Besides the churches to which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners give only partial help, many others have been built or enlarged without any assistance from them. The restoration of St. Patrick's Cathedral is an example known to everybody. Of the many mis-statements, therefore, which are current about the Irish Church, none caused more amusement to those acquainted with the subject than one gravely made last December in the 'Pall Mall Gazette,' that the sum total of money given by the Protestants of Ireland for church-building purposes during thirty years was 3159*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* The blunder is not the less ridiculous because the writer did not invent the figures but got them out of a Parliamentary Return which he misunderstood. No one ought to meddle with statistics who has not so much knowledge of his subject as to be able to detect a result extravagantly false. If there were a statement in a French periodical that, with all the English talk about their religious societies, the sum total raised by them all was 31*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.* per annum, who would laugh the less if the writer declared his statement to be derived from authentic documents?

members

members in former days had given for Church purposes, and all that they would further have given could they have foreseen the necessity. And it would be under the further disadvantage that its members, never having been in the habit of paying their own clergy, would require some training before they would respond liberally to appeals for this object. The most steady opponent of the law of primogeniture might own that the elder son would be placed in a far worse position than the rest, if he were first allowed to spend his money and his labour on the family property on the supposition that it was his own, and were after many years forced to divide all with his brothers at a time when they had earned estates of their own.

The arguments used to advocate the confiscation of the revenues of the Irish Church do in reality strike at the whole institution of property. We are told that it is an anomaly that the few should be in possession of Church property, and the many left to provide for their religious wants themselves; but this is an anomaly not peculiar to ecclesiastical property. It is not in that case only that it is the few who enjoy inherited property, and the many left to shift without it. We are told that we ought to govern Ireland in accordance with the wishes of its inhabitants, and we are asked if we can doubt what the result would be if it were submitted to a *plebiscite* how Church property should be disposed of. It is assumed that in estimating the opinion of the people of Ireland the wealth and intelligence of the country are to count for nothing, and that the question is to be decided by mere numbers. In every previous division a majority of the Irish representatives have resisted assaults on Church property; and a correspondent of the 'Pall Mall Gazette' has pointed out that in the late division the Irish members opposed to disestablishment represented 81,558 electors against 69,964 on the other side. But if the matter is to be decided by universal suffrage, can any one doubt either what would be the fate of the landlords of Ireland, if their tenure of their property were submitted to a *plebiscite?* The institution of property is a delicate thing, of its own nature anomalous, and which needs to be guarded by public opinion as well as by law. Respect for the sacredness of property can soon be dissipated if it be made the subject of repeated attacks. At the time of the passing of the Emancipation Act, the Roman Catholic bishops, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Blake, and the other leaders of the party, all used the strongest language as to the inviolability of the Irish Church property; and now after a few years' agitation, one would think from the language of great part of the English press, that nothing can be said in favour of it.

The

The confiscation of the endowments of the Irish Church is no mere Irish question. We are fully persuaded that it is only a question of time when the principles on which we decide the Irish Church question shall be applied to England. It is in vain that Mr. Gladstone assures us that the questions of the Irish and the English Churches are very different, and that he reminds us that the latter counts her adherents by millions. But inasmuch as the dissenters from her communion are also counted by millions, there is every prospect that they will be strong enough hereafter to ask the question, how the principle of an Establishment can be reconcilable with the principle of religious equality in England, if it has been ruled that it is not so in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone's followers are not quite so well disciplined as might be desired, and regardless of the danger of scaring away the birds whom their leader was trying to lure, met with cries of 'Oh, oh! and much laughter' the statement in Mr. Maguire's opening speech that the State Church in England was in accordance with the feelings of the great majority of the people. Experience in similar cases has proved that when men fear to admit principles which make against them, their instinctive fear of danger is a truer guide than the soothing assurance that these principles will not be carried out. At the time of the Emancipation Act, the great argument urged against it was the danger to Church property if Roman Catholics were admitted to Parliament. It was scoffed at as a chimerical fear that forty or fifty members could materially influence the decisions of a House of 658. Roman Catholics protested that even if they had the power to meddle with Church property they had not the will: their bishops made a declaration on the subject, and it was agreed that their representatives should confirm it with an oath; and yet we have seen how it has all ended. We cannot think that so many as forty years will separate the fate of the English and Irish Establishments. If, then, it should ever happen that the connexion between the English Church and State should be dissolved, the question will arise, to whom do the endowments of the Church belong, and what shall be done with them? and it is pretty certain that these questions will be decided by the course that is now taken in Ireland. We may discuss these questions from two points of view: As a matter of right to whom do the ecclesiastical endowments belong, and is the State perfectly free to deal with them; and secondly, As a matter of political expediency, supposing the full ownership to be in the State, how is it wise that she should deal with them. We feel so convinced as to the answer that ought to be given to the second question, that we almost regret the necessity of spending some time on the first. Mr. Mill,

Mill, in one of his essays, argues that no one has any vested right in ecclesiastical property but the present holders of Church preferment, and that provided their life interest be respected no hardship is done to any one by the confiscation of Church property. But the obvious fallacy of this argument is that it assumes that the holders of Church preferment give no equivalent for the income they receive. If they do, those to whom they render services have vested rights which deserve to be respected as much as those of the clergymen themselves. It might as well be contended that the State could without injustice lay hands on the endowments of an hospital, provided that the existing medical officers were paid their salaries during their lifetime. We hold it to be neither historically nor practically true that ecclesiastical endowments are State property, except in the sense that what is held by every corporation and every individual is State property; for unquestionably the State may, if there are sufficiently urgent reasons, deprive any individual or his heirs of what he now enjoys. But historically in the matter of this property dedicated to religious uses, the State has always owned itself to be merely a trustee; and special guarantees for the inviolability of this Irish property were given both in 1800 and 1829. Practically the question Who is in possession of the property? is settled by observing who raises an outcry when it is proposed to meddle with it. All admit * that the religious body which is in possession of these endowments now, has been in the possession of them for 300 years, and the Protestant rent-charge payers of Ireland feel exactly the same sense of injury when told that they are to be deprived of the means of religious instruction they and their fathers for many generations have enjoyed, that they would feel if any portion of their individual property were touched.

But it may be held that the Church property in Ireland is a fund given for the religious instruction of the whole people, and that the State as trustee is entitled to step in and correct the abuse when what was intended for the whole is enjoyed by a part. The simple answer to this is, that the funds in question are neither the funds *originally intended* for the instruction of the whole people, nor are they *sufficient* for the instruction of the whole. On the ground that the income enjoyed by the Established Church was greater than her wants, it has been pared down again and again. Church property has been lost by lay impropriations, by the abolition of tithe of agistment, by the

* We say nothing in this article of the claim made by Irish Churchmen to a pre-Reformation title to their property. Possession for 300 years gives as good a prescriptive title to property as possession for 1000.

establishment

establishment of composition for tithes, by the conversion of the composition into a rent-charge with a reduction of twenty-five per cent., by the abolition of vestry cess and minister's money, and by the introduction of the Poor-laws, a novelty in Ireland, which operates as an income-tax of peculiar severity on the clergy. We were amazed to see that Mr. Lowe is reported, in the debate of the 11th March, to have spoken of Irish Church property as 'the tenth part of the rent of Ireland.' Can he possibly suppose that this is the case? In a tract, the title of which we have placed at the head of this article, Captain Petrie states the actual tithe or tenth part of the annual values of crops, exclusive of live stock, in 1866, as 4,320,680*l.*, the tithe received by the clergy as 401,114*l.*, or less than a tithe of the actual tithe; he computes that the lay impropriations must amount nearly to the latter sum; he states that the Church's income since 1834 has been reduced by 240,000*l.* a year, and that the clergy enjoy the payment of sixteen taxes, of which but six are common to laymen; and moreover, that the clergy are the only persons in the State who pay twice as much poor-rate as any one else.*

It is plainly not fair by repeated acts to cut down the income of the Established Church to what is barely sufficient for the wants of her own members, and then to treat this reduced fund as that which ought to bear the charge of provision for the whole people. The Report of the Irish Church Commission will, we expect, fully establish the fact, that the present revenues of the Church are not greater than her requirements. It is true that attempts are industriously made to produce a contrary impression, by citing the cases of beneficed clergymen who have few or no Protestants to attend to. But those who have made these representations now shrink from allowing the truth of their statements to be tested, and show the most eager impatience that the question of the Irish Church should be decided without waiting for the Report of the Commission. That there is good reason for this haste is proved by Dr. Gayer, one of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for Ireland, in a letter to the Irish Attorney-General, the title of which we have placed at the head of this

* To illustrate the effect of this charge he gives the following table of poor-rate in one county in 1851:—

Rent-charge paid by Protestants	£12,629
" " Roman Catholics	581
	£13,210
Poor-rate paid by clergy	3,277
Remainder, not deducting fifteen other taxes	£9,933

 article.

article. He there exposes and illustrates by examples the different devices which have been resorted to, in order to make the income of the Irish clergy appear as large, and their congregations as small, as possible. One fallacy deserves to be mentioned, because it involves a trap into which any one who consults the census returns is likely to fall unless specially warned. If we take out of the returns made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the income of the rectory of A, and out of the census returns the Protestant population of the parish of A, we might naturally think ourselves at liberty to 'combine our information.' But it constantly happens that the *benefice* of A is of wider extent than the parish of A, as given in the census; and in confounding the two we should make the same mistake as if we were to set down the population of the city of Durham as that of the county of Durham. The fact is, that the parochial divisions in the Established Church and in the Roman Catholic, as may be expected, do not coincide; and the Census Commissioners, instead of following the divisions of either, follow the division of the Ordnance survey into what are called civil parishes. Several of these last may go to make up the district superintended by one Protestant clergyman. It has been repeated *ad nauseam* that there are 199 parishes in Ireland without a Protestant parishioner, and the impression intended to be conveyed is that there are 199 clergymen with nothing to do. But the divisions in question are, some of them, extremely minute; and not one constitutes the sole charge of a clergyman. Some of them are the sites of ancient monastic buildings: one is only forty yards square, another is covered by a brewery, another by a flour-mill, another contains but nine inhabitants, another but eighteen.

Although this matter was fully explained by Archbishop Beresford in his Charge of 1864, these 199 parishes have figured in almost every anti-Church declamation since, and in particular in some speeches of Mr. Jacob Bright's, for which he was taken to task by Sir Frederick Heygate in the first Irish debate. When Sir Frederick Heygate had fully explained the difference between parishes and benefices, Mr. Bright, taking a hint from Falstaff, protested that he had known it all the time, and insisted that the fact that it took several parishes to make a benefice, proved the extreme sparseness of Protestants in the country. But in the name of wonder, where is the *abuse* in this? We need not go out of the city of London to see that the present distribution of population does not always correspond to the ancient division of parishes. Is it to be made a matter of reproach to a Church that she tries to make her arrangements correspond to the existing state of things, and when it is proved that one clergyman can sufficiently

sufficiently take charge of a district to which in former times two or three were assigned, she alters her distribution of benefices accordingly? If some instances can be produced where a clergyman is overpaid for his work, there are as many more where he is underpaid. The assailants of the Church Establishment say nothing of such cases as Newtownards, with a church population of 2500, the incumbent of which has lately succeeded in obtaining an augmentation of income from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, his augmented income now being 123*l.*; as Miltown, Armagh, where the Church population is 2250, and the augmented income 130*l.*; as Ballymacarrett, where the population is 3390, and the augmented income 134*l.*; instances to which a host of others might be added.

A Roman Catholic gentleman, Mr. Aubrey de Vere, has shown the unfairness of Lord Russell's rough way of estimating the comparative wants of different religious denominations by counting the number of members belonging to each. He points out that Lord Russell overlooks two important considerations. We must look not only to the numbers, but to the area over which they are distributed. The district of which a single clergyman can take charge is plainly limited in extent; and we must look rather to the number of clergy which a Church will require to employ, than to the number of people to which each ministers. The labour imposed by the public ministrations of the clergy is slightly affected by the size of their congregations. It is as laborious to preach or say mass to a congregation of fifty, as to one of five hundred. If a gentleman requires a tutor for his son, 100*l.* a year is no extravagant remuneration. It does not follow that he must in fairness give 500*l.* a year if he has five sons; or that a schoolmaster in charge of 500 boys has a right to complain if he does not make a profit of 50,000*l.* a year. And the second consideration is that the married clergy of the Church of England may reasonably expect each a larger remuneration than men pledged to celibacy.* Bearing these things in mind, we think it unlikely that the result of the Irish Church Commission will show that the Established Church is in possession of a larger revenue than she requires for her own wants; much less that she is in pos-

* There are at present in Ireland, in round numbers, 2000 Anglican clergymen, 600 Presbyterian, and 2500 Roman Catholic; so that Lord Russell's plan of giving one portion to be divided among the Anglicans, one among the Presbyterians, and six among the Roman Catholics, would have the practical effect that for every pound received by an Anglican clergyman, a Presbyterian should receive more than three, and a Roman Catholic nearly five. It may be asked, Why should not the Anglicans be content with the same number of clergymen as the Presbyterians? For this simple reason, that the Presbyterians are confined within the limits of one province, the Anglicans spread over the whole island.

session of enough for the religious instruction of the whole of Ireland.

If, then, the State declare that she is bound as trustee to enter again into possession of the ecclesiastical revenues, and with them provide for the religious instruction of people of every denomination, she is bound also as trustee to make good the funds destined for religious instruction which she has allowed to be diverted to other objects. It is on these principles that we defend the proposal made in our last number of a new grant for the religious instruction of those for whom no public provision is now made. But supposing the State to refuse to make any such new grant, then since the ecclesiastical revenues are only enough to provide for the wants of part of the people, that part which has been long in possession of them has the best claim to them. We cannot see that the title of the Established Church differs essentially from that of the inheritor of any of the Irish forfeited lands. It is too late now to investigate the propriety of the original grant. We must recognise the goodness of a title established by long prescription. Lord Cairns has said that there is no right of principle on which Parliament can interfere to alienate property possessed by a corporate body by long title, and not greater in amount than that body can usefully employ. If the endowment of a hospital had increased in value to an amount manifestly greater than its needs, the State might equitably interfere to divert the excess to other kindred uses. But if there were no such excess it would not be a good reason for confiscating the funds of a hospital in one town, that other towns had got none; though it might be a reason for making the wants of those not already provided for matter of public concern. Take, however, the most unfavourable view of the case. Suppose the ecclesiastical revenues to be the absolute property of the State, and the Church but a tenant at will. It is confessed by the assailants of the Church that, whatever might have been the shortcomings of her clergy in former days, they now as a body discharge their duty with assiduity, zeal, and Christian charity, benevolent towards those of other communions, anxiously labouring for the instruction of their own. Now, what would be said of the landlord of a farm which has continued in one tenancy, passing from father to son, for many generations, if, though the present holder were confessedly fulfilling well the duties of a tenant, he were suddenly to step in and evict him, confiscate all his improvements, and, careless what became of him, turn him out to starve on the road-side? On no principle of equity can the State dissolve its connexion with the Church without taking care that after the separation the Church shall be placed in a position

position efficiently to carry on the work for which she was constituted. Practically the recognition of the right of the Church if disestablished to the continued possession of her property, is facilitated by the fact that the Church of Rome disavows any wish to claim it for her own use; so that while the problem of disestablishment is simple, that of disendowment brings us at once face to face with the perplexing question, What is to be done with the confiscated revenues?

We pass from considerations of justice to those of political expediency. The only motive for meddling with the question now is the hope of healing and reconciling Irish dissensions, and we must plainly not act now so as to leave a legacy of bitter hatred to future generations. If Protestants have exercised tyranny over Roman Catholics in former days, we cannot hope that the problem will be satisfactorily solved by allowing Roman Catholics now to exercise similar tyranny over Protestants. We dismiss at once, then, the proposal to take the property of the one Church and hand it over to the other. This is in substance Lord Russell's proposal; for though he is so considerate as to offer the Established Church a dividend of 2*s.* 6*d.* in the pound on her own property, this would little mitigate the angry feelings caused by the transfer. The Protestants would not the less cry out that they had been robbed, even if their plunderer, after the example of the gentlemanly highwaymen of former days, flung them a little silver out of their own purse for the prosecution of their journey. It is quite possible that a majority of them would prefer simple secularisation of Church property; but it is not easy to say how a man would decide if asked whether he would prefer that 800*l.* of his property should be confiscated for the uses of the State, or that only 700*l.* should be taken for purposes which he utterly dislikes. One would think that any one would be deterred from proposing now to hand over the property of one Church to another by the experience of the bitterness of feeling still caused by the belief that such a transfer was made 300 years ago. And yet our ancestors never dreamed of committing such an injustice. With scarcely an exception, none of the Irish bishops or clergy were dispossessed at the time of the Reformation, and no greater change took place then than we see taking place every day when clergymen of the opinions of the late Mr. Simeon are succeeded by disciples of Dr. Pusey, or these again by men holding the opinions of the Dean of Westminster.*

* The real weakness of the Irish Church dates from
The Church Establishment before the Reformation was in

There comes then to be considered the proposal to secularise the funds of the Irish Church; but here we encounter the difficulty not to help the Imperial revenues at the expense of Ireland. If we devote these funds to educational or any other purposes for which it belongs to the province of the State to provide, and for which Parliament has already shown itself willing to make liberal grants, we shall only transfer a burden from the Imperial to the local revenue, and so do exactly the reverse of what Irish financial reformers have long been clamouring for. Certainly when men declare that a nation's discontent is well founded, and when they profess to remove the causes of it, one expects to hear that it is proposed to give to the discontented people something of which they had been deprived and which they ought to have. The present favourite plan for removing Irish discontent does not propose to give anything to anybody; but only to deprive one section of the people of property which they have enjoyed without question for at least three hundred years.

If such a plan has the effect of uniting the Irish people, it can only be of uniting them in hostility to England; by taking impartial care that those who have been hitherto silent about grievances shall now have sufficient to complain of. And this is the great recommendation of the plan to some Irish agitators, who count on it as giving hopes for a great development of anti-English feeling. Dean O'Brien declares that the Church established by law is a premium to anti-national sentiment. 'We shall make more Irishmen by the repeal of the union between Church and State than we have lost by five years' emigration.' Some grounds for such hopes are afforded by the fact that there widely prevails among Irish Protestants a strong feeling that they are treated with injustice by England. They say 'We are completely innocent of all disloyalty, yet none have such cause as we to dread any peculiar manifestation of Fenian violence. If we are not the first to suffer by it in our own persons, the English press is sure next day to call out for our chastisement. A few lines may perhaps touch on the disagreeable necessity of punishing the actual offenders, but the bulk of the article will treat of the importance of putting down the Irish Orangemen; for it is an article of faith with many that every Irish Protestant is an Orangeman, and that an Orangeman is a wretch in whose favour nothing can be said. We are like a child governed by a stepmother, and know that when the pet of the house has been particularly

---

of the English settlers, not of the native Irish, who were counted as barbarians. At the Reformation the Irish Church Establishment followed the views current in England, but no attempt was made to propagate similar opinions among those using the Irish language.

naughty

naughty and turbulent, in addition to having our faces scratched by the child, we shall be whipped by the mama for making her darling cry.' They complain that when it is proposed to deprive them of what they regard as their inherited property, instead of attempting to satisfy them that the nation's good requires the sacrifice, violence and misrepresentation are resorted to. Respectable newspapers, incapable of denying a fair hearing to other opponents, publish gross misrepresentations about the Irish Church, and refuse to insert any correction (see Dr. Gayer's pamphlet, p. 11). And yet nothing can be more gratuitous than such misrepresentations, for the assailants of the Irish Church cry out equally for its demolition, however the facts turn out to be. If its members in some districts are proved by the census returns to be few and scattered, it is pronounced to be an absurdity to keep a Church Establishment for so small a number of persons. If they appear to be numerous, they are said to be all the better able to help themselves. If they are thought to be apathetic about giving money for church-building purposes, it is said to be no hardship to deprive them of the services of a Church for which they care so little. If they are zealous and liberal their Church will be sure to flourish on the voluntary system. If their clergy exert themselves for the conversion of Roman Catholics, they are firebrands, troublers of the public quiet, men who wound the feelings of peaceable neighbours. If they confine their ministrations to their own people, they convict their Church of having failed in its mission. At the present time, if the lay members of the Church are silent, or are temperate in their language, they are said to be indifferent to the threatened spoliation. If they speak with the vehemence of men threatened with a grievous loss, they are menaced with Crown prosecutions. For even the right of petition is attempted to be denied to the Irish Protestants. Their meetings for the purpose of petitioning Parliament that the existing arrangement of property should not be disturbed have been stigmatised as offensive and insulting to their fellow citizens. The leader of the Opposition could stoop to affect to treat such meetings as deserving to be classed with openly seditious assemblies, and could blame the Government for not sending shorthand writers to report if any fervid orator deviated from the calm and argumentative tone which characterised the proceedings on the whole. Undoubtedly a mischievous effect has been produced in Ireland by the language of many Englishmen who seem not to care whet
measure proposed for Ireland be just or unjust, provi
will secure peace and quiet. The impression pr
combination in illegal societies is more men's

peaceable obedience to law, and that those are in danger of losing their rights who do not show that they can be formidable or troublesome.

Some time since the 'Tablet' declared that even if the wealth of the Establishment were devoted to Catholic purposes to-morrow, we should not have reached the seat of the disorder. 'The wound of Ireland is, that whereas the great majority of the population of Ireland are Catholics, such a large proportion of the soil belongs to Protestants, and that Protestants form such a large portion of those classes which, by superior wealth and superior advantages, are raised in social station higher than the rest.' In other words, while it would justly be condemned as persecution to evict a tenant because he was not of the religion of his landlord, it is not thought unfair to demand that landlords shall be dispossessed if they are not of the religion of their tenants, and that men of superior wealth or education shall similarly be subjected to loss if their conscientious convictions do not conform to the prevailing sentiments. The principal organ of Dublin Roman Catholic opinion, the 'Freeman's Journal,' has recently intimated that the disestablishment of the Irish Church is to be followed by a pressure put upon Irish Protestant landlords. In the article which announced the result of the late division, it says: 'The great evil of the Establishment lies in the consequences it entails in the practical outlawry by the State of the national Church, and *in the absence of the due relations which should subsist between the landed proprietors and the priests, the temporal and spiritual leaders of the people.* These consequences were scarcely alluded to in the debate, and yet they are the most precious fruits of the vote.' The doubt now is, whether the English sense of justice affords any protection against such demands; or whether, if it seems that by yielding to them the management of Ireland will give them less trouble, Englishmen will not be found to maintain that principles may be good in Ireland which they would not tolerate at home.

These fears may be thought chimerical, but there is another very generally entertained by Irish Protestants which we cannot pronounce to be unfounded. It is lest the present moderation may not be lasting of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics who now disclaim the wish to place their own Church in the position of the one now established. The Irish representatives of a Parliament elected on a much reduced franchise, are likely to be greatly under the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy. —
to be willing to grant them for the uses of their religion
they may ask. On the principle of governing Irela
to the wishes of the Irish, the Irish members wo

to make, probably, not out of Imperial, but out of local revenues, a more splendid provision for the Roman Catholic Church than that which is now rejected. In other respects the laws of Ireland, it is feared, would be assimilated to those of Spain. Public religious processions would be permitted, and persons punished who did not treat them with respect; hereditary Protestants allowed to read the Bible among themselves, but punished if they tampered with the faith of others; the children of mixed marriages, and all other doubtful cases, claimed for the predominant creed; Protestantism made, if not a legal, a practical disqualification for public employment. It is invidiously said that the Protestants of Ireland are anxious for ascendancy: what they really desire is protection against the tyranny which a majority too often exercises over a minority, a danger not the less to be dreaded when the majority consists of fanatical members of the Church of Rome. Even now the educated and intelligent Roman Catholics complain of the attempt to crush down individuality of thought among them; and that on such questions as how their own children are to be educated, their wishes are overruled by the ignorant multitudes, of which some of the priests, with an Archbishop at their head, are the leaders. What freedom of thought in Ireland would be left when, under the inevitable working of the voluntary system, dissent from the prevalent creed would be put down in the rural districts of three provinces of the island, and the Protestants driven to England or into the great towns?

There is every reason to think that a simple disendowment of the Irish Church would add to the miseries of Ireland by exasperating religious bitterness to the highest possible degree. There would be on the one side resentment of men believing themselves to have been tyrannically and unjustly deprived of their property—on the other the insolence of triumph over humiliated rivals. Instead of things being settled, there would be an immediate upspringing of new demands; for when once the principle was established that possession for three hundred years does not give a sufficient title to property, there would be a general unsettlement of men's minds in Ireland and a ransacking of historical records to make out ancient claims to property long since in the hands of other possessors. Nor would the aspect of religion in the dispossessed Church probably be such as any enlightened Protestant could contemplate with satisfaction. In the country whole districts must be given up, except where some landlord might provide a cler [illegible] bly educated as to be unreasonably expensive, [illegible] ant servility to merit the favour of [illegible] nd. In the towns we should [illegible] have

have some fluent orators gaining popular support by conformity to current prejudices and by care not to step outside the limits of the local orthodoxy, who would endeavour by controversial success to levy contributions in England from those who love the excitement of new converts, but care little for the dull work of attending to those already in the fold. 'Would it be well,' doubts Bishop Moriarty, 'to change the meek unobtrusive parson into a fiery proselytizing zealot?' 'The want of an endowment,' as Sir G. Cornewall Lewis well remarked, 'necessarily tends to induce a clergyman to use his religious influence in order to gain an ascendancy over the minds of his congregation, and to use that ascendancy in order to gain money. Its inevitable consequence, therefore, is to encourage priestcraft, to promote an illegitimate exercise of the sacerdotal authority, and to give the clergy an interest rather in cultivating the irrational fears, or stimulating the imagination and feelings of their hearers, than in improving their reason by judicious and temperate admonition.' * Hence that lamented statesman, whose opinions on this subject have been strangely misrepresented by a writer in the 'Times,' advocated strongly the payment of the Irish Catholic clergy, and maintained that, if they refused to receive it, 'they could afterwards have no right to complain of the injustice of the State in bestowing an exclusive endowment on the Protestant Church.' †

Are we to consider the recent vote of the House of Commons as indicating that the future of Ireland must be such as we have described? We think not: we believe that it expressed the conviction of the majority that Ireland ought to be governed on principles of religious equality, but that it is very far from being the opinion of the House that the voluntary system is that most likely to secure the interests of religion either in England or Ireland. Lord Grey is a signal example that a strong assertion of the principle of religious equality may be combined with an equally strong disapproval of the voluntary system. The manner in which Lord Grey would have preferred to work out the principle of equality would have been by bringing the Roman Catholic Church into connexion with the State alongside of a Protestant establishment maintained on a reduced scale. But regarding this solution of the problem to be now impracticable, and that the Roman Catholic Church must remain altogether unconnected with the State, he holds that the principle of equality requires that the Protestant Church should be disestablished; that is to say, that its bishops should cease to be

* 'The Irish Disturbances and the Irish Church Question,' p. 432.
† Ibid., p. 433.

appointed

appointed by the Crown and to sit in the House of Lords, and that it should be organised as a voluntary association. But he takes pains to convince Mr. Bright that on the latter's own principles disestablishment does not imply disendowment. He says:—

'Though thus far I agree in your views, I cannot extend the same approbation to your proposal that the Protestant Church should be disendowed as well as disestablished. You have yourself pointed out that the one by no means necessarily implies the other, and that the Protestant Nonconformists in this country seem to confound establishments with endowments. Yet it is clear that a Church, without being established, or in any way connected with the State, but strictly retaining its character of a purely voluntary association, may be possessed of an endowment. Indeed, I believe there is no considerable body of Christians of any denomination, united together as a Church, which has not found it necessary to create a fund to meet its necessary expenses, which constitutes what is, to all intents and purposes, an endowment. * * * * There are a very large number of persons in this country, of whom I acknowledge myself to be one, who consider it of infinite importance to the highest welfare of a nation, that by some means or other a large fixed income, not merely depending on the voluntary contributions of the passing hour, should be available for the religious instruction of the people. I regard it as a palpable and dangerous fallacy to affirm that those who require religious instruction and consolation ought to pay for it, and that the support of the ministers of religion ought to be left to be provided for by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. Those who stand most in need of religious instruction are precisely those who are the least willing to pay for it, and experience clearly proves that, even with the assistance of a large endowment, the most strenuous voluntary exertions, on the part of both Churchmen and Dissenters, fail to provide nearly adequate means for the religious instruction of the population. Thousands of our fellow countrymen now grow up, and live and die, without ever having the great truths on which all Christians are agreed made known to them; and this is justly regarded as one of the greatest evils under which the country is now suffering. * * * * It is nothing short of robbery of the poor to divert to any lower purpose the property which ought to be applied in teaching the great truths of religion.'

Lord Grey has expressed his opinion that this question admitted of a peaceable solution, if not made the occasion of a violent party struggle, an opinion which receives some confirmation from the fact that, differing from Lord Grey as to many of his conclusions, we find ourselves in agreement with him as to the most important principles on which the question is to be settled. We need not repeat the reasons we gave in our last number

number for holding that religious equality ought to be obtained, not by confiscating the provision which is at present made for the religious instruction of the people, but by extending the benefit of it to those who are now unable to take advantage of it. We agree with Lord Grey in thinking that the Roman Catholics of Ireland would not reject aid for religious purposes if tendered to them 'in such a way as to make it free from all taint of suspicion of being intended to promote any designs of a sinister or unfriendly character.' We venture to say that a majority of educated lay Roman Catholics would prefer to obtain equality by 'levelling up' rather than 'levelling down.' Those reasons which we before enumerated, and which prevent the priests from desiring State pay, do not apply to the laity. They would for the most part be glad enough if the State were to step in and relieve them of the expense of supporting their clergy. The strength of this feeling among them is indicated by the terms of the declaration, extensively signed by the Roman Catholic laity a little time ago. When Cardinal Cullen commenced the agitation for the disendowment of the Irish Church, scarcely any lay Roman Catholic of weight for a long time took part in the movement, and the declaration to which we allude was intended as an answer to the taunts to which this backwardness gave rise. Yet the declaration when it appeared was found to ask merely for religious equality, and not to contain any demand for disendowment; and we may conclude that Cardinal Cullen would have drawn up his document in accordance with the programme announced by himself if he had not found that if so worded it would have met so many refusals to sign it as to be without moral weight.

Our most important difference with Lord Grey is that his scheme utterly ignores any special right of the Established Church to her endowments, founded on long possession, such as we have tried to show she has. We altogether dissent from the principle that nothing shall be given to the Roman Catholics unless it be taken from the Protestants; and we feel indignation at the political hypocrisy of those who attempt to raise a Protestant cry when it is proposed to make a State grant for Roman Catholic religious purposes; when the same persons have no scruple to propose that property belonging to a Protestant church should be transferred to Roman Catholics. We are amazed that any Statesman should at such a crisis dream of trying to make some profit for the Chancellor of the Exchequer out of the fund provided for Irish religious instruction. Mr. Gladstone's plan may perhaps gain as much as would annually furnish an armour-plated frigate. Lord Grey hopes to save the amount

amount of the Regium Donum and the Maynooth Grant. We hold, on the contrary, that the fund as it at present exists should be rather increased than diminished, if we desire to make it available for new objects. It is the duty of Parliament to consider what the exigencies for which it is desired to provide require, and not to lay it down as a principle that whether these exigencies can be met well or ill, under no circumstances shall anything be added to the remnant that repeated reductions have left of the fund once intended for the religious instruction of the Irish people.

We have said so much about Lord Grey's pamphlet because it is written in a tone of superiority to party spirit, which entitles it to patient and respectful consideration from peace-loving men of all opinions. Lord Grey condemns quite as strongly as we could do the wickedness of making such a question an opportunity for a great trial of party strength. With reference to the plea that this move was wanted in order to reunite the Liberal party, he asks, 'I would venture to ask you whether you really think that this is justifiable? Is it right that Ireland should wantonly be made the battle-field of parties? When I consider the fearful evils which may thus be produced, how imperatively it is the duty of every honest man to try to soothe passions of the two hostile parties in Ireland, I confess myself quite at a loss to understand how a question so calculated to exasperate their animosities can have been selected as that on which the Government is to be attacked.'

But we must hasten to speak of Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions. We shall not inquire into the secret history of their formation, nor ask how it came to pass that when they mean disendowment they only speak of disestablishment. Mr. Gladstone's speech has removed the ambiguity with which the wording of the Resolutions is justly chargeable. But Mr. Gladstone has not given another explanation which every one called on to vote for his Resolutions has a right to demand. He proposes to take money now devoted to one object, and to give it to another. Surely we must inquire what is this other object, and is it a better one than that on which the money is now spent? Silence on this point can only be justified on the supposition that the object on which the money is now spent is so bad that *anything* would be better. This may be maintained by the extreme voluntaries, who hold that it is a sin that religious teaching should be maintained by endowments; or by the Roman Catholic clergy, who consider it sinful that money should be expended on the teaching of heresy: but it certainly is not the opinion of the majority of the House of Commons, who have no other fault to find with

the work done by the Irish clergy than that the benefits of it are limited to so few. If, then, the work for which the money is now spent is itself a good one, we ask to be told the better one which it is intended to substitute. We have already spoken of the injury done to Ireland, if Irish funds are taken for objects which are now provided for out of the imperial revenues. Is the matter mended if the objects are such as it is now thought not wise to spend public money on? For instance, Sir John Gray proposes that this money should be kept as 'a public reproductive fund for the development of the resources of Ireland, to which all classes might apply for the advancement of a useful public object;' language which is thus translated by the Dean of Clonfert: 'In other words, the property set apart in former times for maintaining the national religion and disseminating the divine principles of national virtue, shall be converted into a special fund for the perpetual propagation of jobbery and corruption, the relaxation of self-dependent industry, and the permanent encouragement of the pauper spirit of dependence on public aid.' It has been proposed to give the money for higher education, but besides that this is an object to which it would seem that the Government thinks it not unfit to ask Parliament to contribute out of the imperial revenues, the Church of Rome demands that education shall be denominational and exclusive, and it may as well be proposed at once to transfer these funds in whole or in part from the Anglican Church to the Church of Rome as give them for the uses of a Catholic university. Many are of opinion that it *would* be best to give these funds for Roman Catholic purposes; either for the purchase of glebe lands and parsonage houses for their clergy, or for increasing the influence of the priests by putting at their disposal money to distribute under the name of alms. If Mr. Gladstone is in favour of a transference of this money, openly or in disguise, to Roman Catholic uses he ought at once to say so, and not meanwhile by his silence take advantage of a Protestant cry raised against a proposal to provide in any other way for the religious wants of the Irish Roman Catholics. Lastly may be noticed Mr. Gladstone's own proposal, made we know not whether in jest or earnest, that out of the Church property shall be provided lands on which Mr. Bright, Mr. Mill, and other philosophers, may try experiments. We recommend that a special committee, with Lord Dufferin as chairman, be appointed to consider whether the advantages to be gained by such experiments are likely to justify the confiscation of the fund provided for Irish religious instruction.

If we desired to introduce dissension into a united family, we know

know no better expedient than to leave among them a legacy in words so uncertain that it could not be determined without litigation to which individual the bequest should belong. Can Mr. Gladstone devise no better means for the pacification of Ireland than to gain by the spoliation of one section of the people a fund whose destination he will not indicate, to be scrambled for by the community? It may be clever in party tactics to observe reticence which may gain now for the confiscation of Irish Church property the votes of some who, could they know its ultimate destination, would prefer that it should remain as it is. But is it becoming in an English statesman to enlist recruits in a scheme of spoliation for an unknown object, by the promise that after the victory there shall be an impartial lottery of the plunder? It is certainly strange that Mr. Gladstone should be the author of a scheme for the demolition of the Irish Church so complete as to take away the breath of Mr. Bernal Osborne; stranger still that in the course of three speeches he should make no attempt to answer his own recorded arguments. If any one will take from his late speeches what is occupied with explanation of his plans, with defence of his own consistency, with taunts against his opponents for their blindness in not perceiving that the fated hour of the Irish Church has come, he will find that scarcely anything is left as a reason for the sweeping change that is proposed. What looked most like an argument was an attempted proof of the failure of the Irish Church drawn from a comparison of the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in this and in the last century. But, in truth, the causes of the multiplication of Roman Catholics were social, not religious. The operation of the penal laws which endeavoured to gain for Protestantism the wealthy, the intelligent, and the educated classes of Ireland, gave to Romanism what is now considered more important than anything else—numbers. Even the poor Protestants made it their ambition to appear in church well clad, and being brought by their religion into contact with the higher classes imbibed from them a higher standard of living. While their Roman Catholic neighbours married early and had large families, the Protestants delayed marriage until they could see that they had the prospect of bringing up their children with the decencies and little luxuries which they had learned to think essential. In competition for land Protestants were underbid by Roman Catholics, who were content to demand for their portion a less share of the produce. In severe times the Protestants were the first to emigrate; in fact, before 1847 Irish emigration was principally Protestant; and the priests discouraged the emigration of their flocks, not merely, as uncharitable people

people said, lest the contributors to their support should be diminished, but also on account of the real danger to the faith of the emigrants, who were not then in sufficient masses in America to be able to defend themselves against the pressure of the surrounding Protestantism. At that time men whose faith in Romanism had been shaken betook themselves to America where they could profess their new convictions without fear of persecution. It is only since the famine that emigration has become Roman Catholic, and accordingly the last census * first showed an increase of the ratio in Ireland of Protestants to Roman Catholics.

Mr. Gladstone takes credit for leaving to the Church three-fifths or even two-thirds of her property. But this is mere rhetorical exaggeration. Money given as purchase for advowsons, or even as compensation to the existing clergy, is given to Irish churchmen, not to the Irish Church, which, when the present generation dies out, would be left with the church fabrics and the glebe houses, the value of which is the real measure of Mr. Gladstone's liberality.

We admit that Mr. Gladstone was under a strong temptation to exaggerate the amount of his concessions; for there was indeed a violent contrast between the generosity of the sentiments expressed by himself, and by Mr. Bright, and the stinginess of his actual proposals. Mr. Bright told us that 'it is a great thing in statesmanship, when you are to make a change which is unavoidable, and which shocks some and disturbs more and increases the doubt of the hesitating, if you can make the past slide into the present without any great shock to the feelings of the public.' 'In doing these things Government can always afford to be generous and gracious to those whom it is obliged to disturb.' And then he spoke of the twenty millions that had been voted by Parliament as a compensation to the slave-holders when slavery was abolished. From such a preamble one expected to hear what sum of money he proposed that Parliament should give in order to establish religious equality in Ireland, in such a way that those who had to descend from a position of freedom might suffer as little sense of injury as possible. It sounds like the grim courtesy of the Cyclops, when it turns out that the 'gracious generosity' consists in this, that, when the State lays hands

* Mr. Bright could never have looked at the census returns, else he would not have expressed the suspicion that every one not a Catholic or a Presbyterian was put down as an Episcopalian. A glance at the census returns, in which every variety and even singularity of religious opinion is carefully enumerated, will show the anxious care taken in 1861 that the Irish Church should get credit for no members who did not properly belong to her.

on

on all the other possessions of the Church, the fabrics and glebe-houses are on certain conditions to be left untouched. Considering that the glebe-houses have been built entirely at the expense of the clergy, and the Church fabrics partly by a tax levied on the clergy, partly by the voluntary contributions of the Protestant laity, it is not generosity but common justice that they should remain with those who built them. And considering the probability that the laying hold of the buildings and the turning out the congregations would provoke in many places tumults and retaliatory outrages, when from the price that the buildings would fetch is deducted the cost of prosecutions and police, the amount of sacrifice involved in this generosity is not great. But Mr. Gladstone cannot even bring himself to consent that these buildings should become the absolute property of the Church; he proposes that they should be held by her only as long as she keeps them in repair. It would be impossible to frame a condition more ingeniously devised for the purpose of perpetuating the heartburnings caused by a transfer of Church property. One great spoliation is not to be the end of the matter; it is to be followed by a number of petty ones spread over a series of years. The little wreck of Church property is to be watched by hungry claimants, taking eager note when a Protestant proprietor becomes non-resident, or when a zealous Protestant is succeeded by one unwilling to contribute largely for Church purposes. Then, when the remaining Protestants find themselves unable to raise a sufficient sum to secure the services of a clergyman, they are to undergo the further humiliation of seeing their church sold for the benefit of a fund of which every one anticipates the priests will take care to have the chief management. Every year a large sum of money has been voluntarily expended in church building by Irish Protestants, on the understanding that the churches which they built would be kept in repair by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and that clergymen would be provided for them out of the Church funds. Is it not sufficient breach of faith if the conditions on which this money was given are not fulfilled, and if the expenditure incurred is thus in some cases rendered useless, without also confiscating what can be saved by the sale of fabrics no longer needed for purposes to which the original donors would not have given a penny?

Some few words must be added as to Mr. Gladstone's second and third Resolutions, which we think will be rejected by many willing to vote for the first. In his treatment of individuals, as well as of the Church herself, Mr. Gladstone prefaces with professions of liberality proposals as illiberal as public opinion could be expected to tolerate. When Parliament deprived proctors of

 their

their monopoly, the existing members of the profession were compensated for their loss; when a department of the civil service is closed, the existing officials are allowed to draw their salaries for their lifetime. A proposal to disendow the Church without providing for the existing clergy would not be listened to for a moment. Accordingly, in his opening speech, Mr. Gladstone declared that, supposing disendowment to take place, 'every vested interest, every proprietary right, every legitimate claim, must be respected, and that in every case of doubt that may arise we must honestly endeavour to strike the balance in favour of the other party and against ourselves.' These cases of doubt cannot arise with the actual holders of Church preferment, the value of which can be easily ascertained. But there is such a thing as a reasonable expectation of preferment not now actually enjoyed: in some instances amounting to an absolute right, as in the case of the Fellow of a College, or the member of a Chapter; in others, to a moral certainty, as in the case of the holder of a promise from a patron; in others to a tolerable assurance, as in the case of the older curates of the dioceses, whose claims are recognised by all the Bishops. In Ireland the majority of the parishes are in the gift of the Bishops, who use their patronage in such a way that curates may reasonably calculate on ultimate promotion to a benefice, and the holders of the small livings on promotion to a better. The Church, in fact, has paid her ministers with hope: for no one can pretend that the pittance which is a curate's salary is sufficient remuneration for the services of an educated gentleman. Strictly speaking, the only way in which the claims could be met of men who had taken a profession, which they have no power of changing, on the faith of the continuance of present arrangements, would be by providing that the patrons of preferment should be empowered to fill up vacancies as long as they could do so, from men at present in holy orders. Roughly these claims might be met by providing that promotions might take place for a certain number of years after the passing of the Act. And the case is not one in which there is violent hurry to get immediate possession of a fund for an important object. A few years are a small time in the life of a nation, and the enemies of the Church might be content with the assurance of its ultimate demolition. Mr. Gladstone in his 'leniency' proposes that all possibility of promotion shall cease, as far as he has power to prevent it, from the present time; that is to say, at least a year *before* any measure of disendowment can be passed. A curate who may have been twenty years or more in orders must learn that, if the living were to become vacant to-morrow to which he had been looking forward as the reward of his services,

vices, he must not enjoy it; and that he can be considered as having no legitimate claim. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, has intimated the possibility that he may be induced to give some consideration to the case of the curates, an announcement not favourably received by his followers: but no way of meeting their claims is so simple and so little costly, as allowing them to receive the promotion on which they have had every reason to calculate.

It might have been supposed that the object of the second and third Resolutions was only to suspend appointment to bishoprics; but the elaborate shabbiness of the clause restraining the action of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners shows that the persons really aimed at are the worst paid and the hardest worked of the clergy. The meaning of this clause seems to have been a puzzle to the Members of the House; and not least to Mr. Gladstone himself, who, in his endeavours to explain it, perpetrated an astounding series of blunders, which we can only account for by supposing that his Irish advisers, who concocted the clause, were ashamed to make known to him its real meaning. Mr. Gladstone says that 'he finds that the erection of new benefices is within the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and that from time to time they perform that operation.' He gave two instances to prove that within the last year they had erected two new benefices, each containing only four Anglicans; and on these grounds he asks for power to restrain them from constituting new benefices, and thus creating new vested rights while the subject is under consideration of Parliament. Now the fact is, that the Irish Ecclesiastical Commissioners have no power to create a benefice; and therefore it is needless to say they did not exercise such a power in the instances alleged by Mr. Gladstone.* The real object of Mr. Gladstone's clause is different.

* One of these examples is so irrelevant that we cannot understand under what delusion it was brought forward. Kilmoylan, a parish containing, as we have ascertained, not four, but over thirty Anglicans, became vacant, and was filled up in due course by the Bishop. The only choice the Bishop had in the matter was whether he could fill the vacancy himself, or allow the presentation to lapse to the Crown. There was no increase made to the number of Irish benefices, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had nothing to say to the transaction. In the other example there was an increase made to the number of Irish benefices, but one in which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had no share. The Bishop has the power, subject to the veto of the Privy Council, of uniting two vacant parishes, *pro hac vice*, into a single benefice. The parishes of Newtown-lennan and Clonegam, both in Crown patronage, had been thus united. On their becoming vacant in 1867, the Bishop refused to reunite them, on the ground, as we are informed, that the parishes were not contiguous, were in different counties, and separated by a navigable river. Whether the Bishop exercised a wise discretion we cannot tell, but the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had no voice in the matter, nor did their funds in any way contribute to it. The only change was that an income was divided between two clergymen, which would otherwise have been enjoyed by one.

While the bulk of the funds at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners is devoted to the building and repairing of churches and supplying requisites for divine service formerly provided by vestry assessment, they have from time to time funds to a small amount available for the augmentation of small livings. The limit to which the Commissioners can augment a living is 200*l.* a year; but the number of pressing applications is so great that they never have been able to go near this limit. We have before us the names of twenty benefices taken out of the list of disappointed applicants for augmentation. The average income of these, including in many cases previous augmentations, is under 125*l.* a year; the average church population 2500. We have not the means of conveniently ascertaining the number of years each clergyman has been in orders. No doubt these and other unsuccessful applicants on the occasion of the last augmentation, whose cases were strong, had reason to know that they would be favourably considered on the next occasion. Yet Mr. Gladstone thinks it necessary to bring in a special clause to disappoint these reasonable expectations. It will be observed that the object of the clause is not as was pretended, to prevent the creation of new sinecures, but to prevent any small increase of income being received by a few clergymen specially picked out because of the smallness of their present income, and its disproportion to their work. Whatever becomes of Mr. Gladstone's first Resolution, we should think that the anti-curate Resolutions have no chance of success.

In his fear of being accused of proposing only an abstract Resolution, Mr. Gladstone asks us to legislate in violent haste on subjects requiring calm and patient consideration. We have said nothing about the Fifth Article of the Act of Union, nor about the Coronation Oath, although we are honestly unable to explain what it was apprehended the Sovereign might do, and what she was required to promise not to do, except the very thing which it is now proposed to ask her to do. We know that a nation can never absolutely tie up its own hands, and our country under monarchical forms has become so republican that it is considered intolerable if the private scruples of the Sovereign forbid any change for which the nation is really anxious. But the Act of Union and the Coronation Oath prove at least this, that the laws which it is proposed to alter may fairly be described as fundamental, and the change which is attempted nothing less than a revolution. Now even a respectable club would not permit its fundamental laws to be altered by surprise. The Irish Church has a right to demand that her fate shall be decided by the solemnity of a regular trial; but her present

present assailant, without even giving notice to his own followers of his intention, springs on her from an ambush like a garotter, and if he can succeed in fixing his second and third Resolutions round her neck, she must wait her doom in a condition of suspended animation, neither enjoying the advantages of State connexion, nor the freedom of the voluntary system, all circulation within her system stopped, and the organs paralysed by which provision is now made to supply the loss when clergymen die or churches drop out of repair.

What is really to be decided now is whether, in the event of a dissolution of connexion between Church and State, the Church's property may rightly be confiscated. And undoubtedly the decision made of that question in the case of Ireland will govern the decision of the same question for England whenever it arises. It has been said by some that it is undesirable that a Church should possess property if unconnected with the State, and it is feared that a completely free Church would make its rules of communion more stringent, and exercise tyranny over the consciences of the minority of its clergy. Against such evils the possession of property is the best safeguard; for where property exists the courts of law will interfere to prevent the rights of those who are entitled to a share in it from being infringed. It is as much the interest of Roman Catholics as of Protestants that the Anglican Church, whether disestablished or not, should remain possessor of property; for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland would have a very precarious tenure of its property were it the only large holder of religious endowments in the kingdom. And it is the interest of the educated and intelligent lay Roman Catholics of Ireland that the Protestants should not, under the influence of a purely voluntary system, be broken up into sects, and thus rendered unable to give them any support in making head against the priestly tyranny which now threatens to engross all power in Ireland.

We do not believe that the majority of those who voted in favour of Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions desire in their hearts the destruction of the Established Church in Ireland. Their real motives are correctly appreciated by the Catholics, whom they fawn upon and flatter. 'The Irish Difficulty,' writes a correspondent in the English organ of the Catholics,*

'presents itself in the form of a contest between English parties as to who shall occupy the Treasury Benches. Who doubts—I ask the question in the firm belief that no well-informed and candid man of

* 'The Tablet,' April 4.

either

either party doubts—that, if Mr. Gladstone had sat on the Speaker's right for the past twelve months, and was still sitting there, he would not have pronounced any of the words "religious equality," "disestablishment," or "disendowment." Mr. Bright would no doubt have done so, but certainly not Mr. Gladstone. In Mr. Bright's mouth those words represent a policy to which he is sincerely, even passionately, attached. In Mr. Gladstone's they are an expedient which must have taken his party by surprise.'

And in a leading article in the same paper we read:—

'For our own part, we cannot change principles and opinions which we have held for years, and which we believe to be sound, merely in order to avoid agreeing with Mr. Disraeli, or to avoid disagreeing with Mr. Gladstone. We can't adopt the creed of the English Dissenters, and become a Cromwellian, an Independent, a Voluntaryist, and a seculariser of Church property, merely for the sake of applauding a party move of Mr. Gladstone's. We cannot help thinking that it would have been better for Ireland and for the Empire if Mr. Disraeli had been allowed to pass his Landlord and Tenant Bill, to grant a charter to the Irish Catholic University, and to repeal the Ecclesiastical Titles Act this year, leaving him to deal with the Irish Church Question in the new Parliament.'

The plain truth is that Mr. Gladstone is willing to destroy the Irish Church, in order to unite the disorganised and broken ranks of his party. But we very much mistake the feelings of the English people if they will quietly allow the dearest interests of their Protestant brethren in Ireland to be sacrificed in order that Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Lowe, and Mr. Horsman may *dwell* together in unity. We call, then, upon all who are able to rise above the interests of party, to resist the pressure used to induce them to legislate in a panic, and, before they vote the confiscation of funds consecrated to their present objects by repeated and most solemn acts of the Legislature, to insist upon knowing to what better objects it is intended to apply them. By hasty and rash action now mischief may be quickly done which long years cannot remedy, and 'more religious discord, more heartburning, and more divisions, be created than we have ever yet seen in Ireland.'

INDEX.

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

A.

B.

C.

D.

I.

J.

L.

M.

N.

O.

P.

Q.

T.

U.

V.

W.

Z.

END OF THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH VOLUME.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET, AND CHARING CROSS.